E Wilkinson

PÆDOBAPTISM

EXAMINED,

ON THE

PRINCIPLES, CONCESSIONS,

AND

REASONINGS,

OF THE MOST LEARNED

PÆDOBAPTISTS.

By ABRAHAM BOOTH.

AS CERTAIN ALSO OF YOUR OWN POETS HAVE SAID. PAUL.

THIS TESTIMONY OF THEIRS, TO ME, IS WORTH A THOUSAND OTHERS: SEEING IT COMES FROM SUCH WHO, IN MY OPINION, ARE EVIDENTLY INTERESTED TO SPEAK QUITE OTHERWISE. DAILLE.

HOW HAPPY IT IS TO HAVE TO DO WITH PEOPLE THAT WILL TALK PRO AND CON! BY THIS MEANS YOU FURNISH ME WITH ALL I WANTED; WHICH WAS, TO MAKE YOU CONFUTE YOURSELVES. PASCAL.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY E. FAWCETT, BLACK-FRIARS;

AND SOLD BY J. BUCKLAND, PATER-NOSTER-ROW;
AND C. DILLY, IN THE POULTRY.

MDCCLXXXIV.


BRITISH MUSEUM

PREFACE.

HAVING obſerved, for a courſe of years, that many of the moſt learned and eminent Pædobaptiſts frequently argue on ſuch principles, admit of ſuch facts, interpret various texts of Scripture in ſuch a manner, and make ſuch conceſſions, as are greatly in favour of the Baptiſts; I extracted a number of paſſages from their publications, and made many references to others, which I thought might be fairly pleaded againſt Infant Sprinkling *. On reviewing theſe quotations and *memoranda*, I concluded, merely for my own private uſe, to employ ſome of my leiſure hours in tranſcribing and arranging them under different heads of the Pædobaptiſt controverſy.—When I had made conſiderable progreſs in the work of tranſcription and arrangement, Mr. HENRY's *Treatiſe on Baptiſm* fell into my hands.

* N. B. As the terms, *Infant ſprinkling*, wherever they occur in this Treatiſe, are uſed merely by way of diſtinction, and not of contempt; ſo the expreſſions, Pædo-*baptiſm*, and Infant-*baptiſm*, are uſed in compliance with general cuſtom; and not becauſe the author thinks an infant is *baptized*, on whom water has been ſolemnly poured, or ſprinkled.

hands*. Prepoſſeſſed of a high regard for the character of that worthy Author, I peruſed the Treatiſe with care. Not being convinced, however, by any thing it contains, that the Sprinkling of Infants is an appointment of Chriſt; and being fully perſuaded that Mr. HENRY had employed his learning, and parts, and zeal, in defence of an unſcriptural ceremony; I determined to proſecute the ſubject with greater application, and to publiſh the reſult of my inquiries and thoughts concerning it. Such was the occaſion of this publication.

The method of arguing here adopted is far from being, either novel, or unfair: it has been uſed by the Spirit of infallibility, againſt Pagans †; by Chriſtians, againſt the Jews ‡; and by Proteſtants, againſt the Roman Catholics. It is, in a particular manner, employed and purſued by the learned Author of, *Popery confuted by Papiſts*; a book, indeed, which I had not ſeen, till the far greater part of theſe pages was compoſed. The following words of that anonymous

* The MONTHLY REVIEWERS, after pronouncing this "the moſt *popular* defence of Infant baptiſm, and of the mode of ſprinkling, that hath appeared," very juſtly add; "Some *reflections*, however, which he caſts on their [the Baptiſts] *mode* of baptiſm (which perhaps the Editor might as well have *omitted*)—are *ſcarcely conſiſtent with that candour and liberality* which might have been expected from the Author, and which, had he been now living, he would probably have diſcovered." *Monthly Review*, for April, 1784. p. 313. The Reader may ſee the uncandid, illiberal manner in which Mr. HENRY has reflected on the baptiſmal immerſion, and ſome remarks upon it, in CHAP. IV. REFLECT. V. of this work.

† Acts xvii. 28. Titus i. 12. ‡ So WITSIUS, for inſtance, in his *Judæus Chriſtianizans*, p. 276—402.

nymous Author may be justly applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present subject. "I will call the church of Rome for a witness to our cause; and if she do not plainly confess the *antiquity* of our tenets, and the *novelty* of her own; if she herself do not proclaim the universality of our faith; if she do not confess, that we are both in the more *certain* and *safe* way in the Protestant church, I will neither refuse the name*"—of an *Anabaptist*, nor any part of that censure which is due to such a character.

Though I do not approve of every sentiment contained in the following quotations produced on behalf of the Baptists; yet, as the generality of those Pædobaptists from whose writings the extracts were made, were persons of great learning and eminence, in the several communions to which they belonged; and as no small number of them were famous Professors in Protestant universities; their declarations, in the *argumentum ad hominem*, cannot but have the utmost weight. Nor can their testimonies, concerning the signification of Greek terms, or the practice of the church in former ages, be hastily rejected, without incurring the imputation of gross ignorance, of enormous pride, or of shameful precipitancy. Considering the quotations adduced, and the characters of those writers from whom they were taken; it is presumed that the leading ideas of another paragraph, in *Popery confuted by Papists*, may be here applied. "If these witnesses had been ignorant and unlearned men, or excommunicate persons in their own church;—there might be some plea why their testimonies should not be admitted. But when the points in question are articles of their own creed; when they are witnessed by popes, by councils, by cardinals,

* *Popery confuted by Papists*, Sect. VIII. p. 43.

cardinals, by biſhops, by learned doctors, and ſchoolmen in their own church, on *our* behalf, and againſt their *own* tenets; I ſee no cauſe why I ſhould not demand judgment in defence of our church, and trial of our cauſe. It is the law of God and man, *I will judge thee out of thine own mouth**." To which I may add the following words of another Pædobaptiſt, which are conſidered by him as a kind of *axiom*. "The *confeſſions of enemies*, and circumſtances favourable to any body of men, collected from the writings of their adverſaries, are deſerving of *particular* regard†." *Teſtimonium Adverſarii contra ſe Validiſſimum.*

Though I am not conſcious of having miſrepreſented the meaning of any Pædobaptiſt, whoſe teſtimony is produced; yet, as the quotations are very numerous, and as many of them are tranſlated from the Latin, it is poſſible that miſtakes may be diſcovered, by ſuch readers as accurately compare the quotations, with the writers from whom they were taken. Such miſtakes, it is hoped however, will be found comparatively few, and of trifling importance. I am perſuaded, therefore, that the judicious and candid will impute them to inadvertency, or ignorance, rather than to a diſingenuous intention.

A learned foreigner has juſtly obſerved, That while all Chriſtians deſervedly acknowledge the Bible as a Divine Revelation; it has fallen out, that every one deſires to find in that ſacred volume, whatever, in his own imagination, *ſeems divine:* and, that men are ſo wonderfully happy, in this reſpect, as hardly ever to complain of being diſappointed, or of having loſt their labour, in ſearching the ſacred Records for what

* *Ut ſupra*, Sect. X. p. 152.

† Dr. PRIESTLEY's *Letters to* Dr. HORSLEY, p. 137.

what they wanted; but all, in the language of ſelf-gratulation, repeat the old εὕρηκα of ARCHIMEDES, *I have found it! I have found it*!* This being the caſe, it is no ſmall ſatisfaction to perceive, that our moſt learned and eminent Oppoſers have ſaid ſo much in favour of *Immerſion*, on a *Profeſſion* of faith, as being the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt.

In the courſe of my Reflections on the language and arguments of ſome Pædobaptiſts, the Reader will meet with a few ſtrokes of pleaſantry. It is preſumed, however, that he will have no reaſon to complain of *ill temper*, or a want of benevolence to any, from whom I conſcientiouſly differ. For though it appears from ſeveral quotations, that the *harſheſt* things have been ſaid of the Baptiſts by ſome of their oppoſers; and though, no doubt, the Baptiſts have ſometimes retorted in an unbecoming manner; yet, as every one muſt confeſs that *the wrath of man worketh not the righteouſneſs of God*, ſo it may be obſerved of the cauſe that is here pleaded,

Non tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtis.

Some perſons affect to repreſent all diſputes about the mode and ſubject of baptiſm, as not only ſtale and unimportant, but as unworthy the character of any who profeſs a warm regard for the Perſon, the atonement, and the grace of Jeſus Chriſt. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that church order, poſitive rites, and external forms of worſhip, are not of equal importance with thoſe doctrines which immediately reſpect the Object of our worſhip, as rational creatures; the ground of our hope, as criminals deſerving to periſh; or the ſource of our bleſſedneſs, as intended for an immortal exiſtence. Nor is the moſt

* WERENFELSII *Opuſcula*, p. 376, 377.

moſt punctual performance of a ritual ſervice, detached from faith in Chriſt and benevolence to man, worthy of being compared with truly devotional principles and virtuous tempers, though attended with much ignorance relating to the poſitive parts of divine worſhip. But is this a ſufficient reaſon for treating the law of baptiſm as if it were of little or no importance—as if it were *obſolete*, or as if our Great Legiſlator had *no meaning* when he enacted it? That mutilation of the ſacred ſupper, which is practiſed in the Romiſh communion, has been ſharply oppoſed and loudly condemned by all denominations of Proteſtants: and is it not *lawful*, is it not matter of *duty*, to oppoſe and condemn ſuch an outrage on divine authority and primitive example? Are we not required to *contend earneſtly*, but with virtuous diſpoſitions, *for* every branch of *that faith which was once delivered to the ſaints?* If, therefore, infants be ſolemnly ſprinkled by divine right, it muſt be the indiſpenſible duty of Pædobaptiſts to contend for it: but if, on the contrary, Infant ſprinkling be a human invention, the Baptiſts are equally bound to oppoſe it, as deſerving to be baniſhed from the worſhip of God, where it has long uſurped the place of a divine inſtitution. If Chriſt be the only Lord and Lawgiver in his own kingdom, then, certainly, it is far from being an indifferent matter whether the laws enacted by him be regarded, or not. For with equal reaſon might any one queſtion, whether our Saviour ſhould be *believed*, in what he declares; as whether he ſhould be *obeyed*, in what he commands. Under the fair pretext of charity, forbearance, and catholiciſm, we might, with MELANCTHON and other adiaphoriſts in the ſixteenth century, conſider the doctrine of juſtification by faith alone, the number

of

of the ſacraments, the juriſdiction claimed by the pope, extreme unction, the obſervation of Popiſh feſtivals, and ſeveral ſuperſtitious rites, as things *indifferent**: or, with others, we might aſſert the innocence of mental error, in matters of doctrine and of worſhip; and ſo, by unavoidable conſequence, render the Bible itſelf of little worth.

The folly and impiety of pleading for charity and peace, at the expence of divine truth and of religious duty, are well repreſented and properly chaſtiſed by a Pædobaptiſt author, in the following manner. "A conſiderable ſuccedaneum for the Chriſtian unity, is the *catholick charity*; which is like the charity commended by Paul, in only this one inſtance, that it *groweth exceedingly*—Among the ſtricter ſort, it goes under the name of *forbearance*. We ſhall be much miſtaken if we think that, by this ſoft and agreeable word, is chiefly meant the tenderneſs and compaſſion inculcated by the precepts of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles. It ſtrictly means, an agreement to differ quietly about the doctrines and commandments of the goſpel, without interruption of viſible fellowſhip. They diſtinguiſh carefully between *fundamentals*, or things neceſſary to be believed and practiſed; and *circumſtantials*, or things that are indifferent. Now whatever foundation there may be for ſuch a diſtinction in *human* ſyſtems of religion, it certainly looks very ill-becoming in the churches of Chriſt, *to queſtion how far* HE *is to be believed and obeyed*. Our modern churches—have nearly agreed to hold all thoſe things *indifferent* which would be inconvenient and diſreputable: and to have communion together, in obſerving ſomewhat like the cuſtoms

* See MOSHEIM's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Cent. XVI. Sect. III. Part II. § 28. VENEMÆ *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Secul. XVI. § 156.

toms of their forefathers. Many of the plaineſt ſayings of Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles, are treated with high contempt, by the advocates of this forbearance—The common people are perſuaded to believe, that all the ancient inſtitutions of Chriſtianity were merely *local* and *temporary*; excepting ſuch as the learned have agreed to be ſuitable to theſe times; or, which have been cuſtomarily obſerved by their predeceſſors. But it would well become the doctors in divinity to ſhew, by what authority any injunction of God can be revoked, beſides *his own*; or, how any man's conſcience can be lawfully releaſed, by cuſtom, example, or human authority, from obſerving ſuch things as were inſtituted by the Apoſtles of Chriſt, in his name—This corrupt forbearance had no allowed place in the primitive churches. The Apoſtle, in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, required of them, to adorn their vocation *with all lowlineſs and meekneſs, with long-ſuffering, forbearing one another*, IN LOVE. But had they diſpenſed with the laws of Chriſt, for convenience and eaſe, it had been forbearing one another *in hatred*. For thoſe laws were expreſſions of his *love*; the *moſt fervent* love that was ever ſhewn among men, directed by infallible wiſdom. Whoſoever, therefore, would obliterate them, or any how attempt to change them, muſt either ſuppoſe himſelf *wiſer* than Jeſus Chriſt, or a *greater friend* to mankind. He muſt be moved, either by an *enormous ſelf-conceit*; or by the ſpirit of *malevolence*—The more thinking part of religious men, obſerving what great miſchiefs have ariſen from contentions about truth,—have found it moſt deſirable to let *truth* alone, and to concern themſelves chiefly about living *profitably* in civil ſociety. To be of ſome religion, is but decent;

and

and the intereſts of human life require that it be *popular* and *compliant*. If men have different notions of Jeſus Chriſt, his divinity, his ſacrifice, his kingdom, and the cuſtoms of his religion, even from what the Apoſtles ſeemed to have; charity demands that we think well of their religious characters, notwithſtanding this. It is unbecoming the modeſty of wiſe men to be confident on any ſide; and *contending earneſtly* for opinions, injures the peace of the Chriſtian church. Thus kind and humble is modern charity!—Inſtead of rejoicing in, or with *the truth*, it rejoiceth in contemplating the admirable piety that may be produced from ſo many different, yea, oppoſite principles—The Chriſtians of old time were taught, not to *diſpute* about the inſtitutions of their LORD, but to *obſerve* them thankfully; and hereby they expreſſed their affection to him and to each other. If that affection be granted to be more important than the tokens of it, it would be unjuſt to infer that the latter have no obligation; which would imply, that Chriſt and the Apoſtles *meant nothing* by their precepts. The Methodiſts have not, indeed, gone ſo far as their ſpiritual brethren [the Quakers] have done, in rejecting all external ceremonies; but they are taught to believe, that all concern about the ancient order and cuſtoms of the Chriſtians is mere *party-ſpirit*, and injurious to the devout exerciſes of the heart. Thus the modern charity vaunts itſelf, in anſwering better purpoſes than could be accompliſhed by keeping the words of Chriſt. It produces *a more extenſive and generous communion*, and animates the devotion of men, without perplexing them by uncertain doctrines, or rigorous ſelf-denial—Although it ſuppoſes ſome Revelation from God, and ſome honour due to

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt; it claims a right to *diſpenſe* with both; to chooſe what, in his doctrine and religion, is fit to be believed and obſerved *."

Being fully perſuaded that I appear in defence of a primitive inſtitution and of apoſtolic practice, I earneſtly commend this publication to the bleſſing of that Sublime Being, who *worketh all things after the counſel of his own will.* Sincerely praying, that evangelical truth and experimental religion, that purity of worſhip and virtuous practice, may flouriſh among all denominations of Chriſtians; I conclude and remain, the Reader's cordial Friend,

Goodman's Fields,
May 29, 1784.

A BOOTH.

BRITISH
20 AP 85
MUSEUM

* *Strictures upon Modern Simony*, p. 48—55.

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. *Concerning the Nature, Obligation, and Importance, of Poſitive Inſtitutions in Religion,* - - - p. 1—16.

CHAP. II. *Concerning the Signification of the Terms, Baptize, and Baptiſm,* - p. 16—44.

CHAP. III. *The Deſign of Baptiſm; Or, the Facts and Bleſſings repreſented by it, both in regard to our Lord and his Diſciples,* - - p. 45—77.

CHAP. IV. *The Practice of John the Baptiſt, of the Apoſtles, and of the Church in ſucceeding Ages, in regard to the Manner of adminiſtering the Ordinance of Baptiſm,* - - p. 78—124.

CHAP. V. *The preſent Practice of the Greek and Oriental Churches, in regard to the Mode of Adminiſtration,* - - - p. 124—126.

CHAP. VI. *The Deſign of Baptiſm more fully expreſſed by Immerſion, than by Pouring or Sprinkling,* - - - p. 126—132.

CHAP. VII. *Concerning the Reaſons, Riſe, and Prevalence of Pouring, or Sprinkling, inſtead of Immerſion,* - - - - p. 133—168.

CHAP. VIII. *No expreſs Precept, or Precedent, in the New Teſtament, for Pædobaptiſm,* p. 168—194.

CHAP. IX. *No Evidence of Pædobaptiſm, before the latter End of the Second, or the Beginning of the Third Century,* - p. 194—221.

CHAP.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. X. *The high Opinion of the Fathers, concerning the Utility of Baptism, and the Grounds on which they proceeded in administering that Ordinance to Infants, when Pædobaptism became a prevailing Practice,* - p. 221—242.

CHAP. XI. *Concerning the Modern Grounds of Pædobaptism; namely, Jewish Proselyte Baptism—External Covenant Relation—Jewish Circumcision—Particular Passages of Scripture—and Apostolic Tradition.*

SECTION I. *Jewish Proselyte Baptism,* p. 243—267.
SECT. II. *External Covenant Relation,* p. 267—294.
SECT. III. *Jewish Circumcision,* p. 295—314.
SECT. IV. *Particular Passages of Scripture,* p. 314—405.
I. MAT. xxviii. 19. - p. 314—333.
II. GEN. xvii. 7. - - p. 333—345.
III. EZEK. xvi. 20, 21. - p. 345—347.
IV. MAT. xix. 14. - p. 348—353.
V. JOHN iii. 5. - p. 354—359.
VI. ACTS ii. 39. - p. 359—366.
VII. ACTS xvi. 15. 33. and 1 COR. i. 16. p. 366—372.
VIII. ROM. xi. 16. - p. 372—375.
IX. 1 COR. vii. 14. - - p. 376—404.
SECT. V. *Apostolic Tradition,* - p. 406—418.

CHAP. XII. *Concerning Infant Baptism, and Infant Communion, as introduced about the same time, and supported by similar Arguments,* p. 419—444.

General Remarks, - p. 444—484.

BRITISH 20 AL 35 MUSEUM.

ERRATA.

Page.	Line.	
17.	30.	for commanedd, read commanded.
29.	6.	Note: for βαβαπτισμενων, read βεβαπτισμενων.
31.	10.	for ſee, read ſay.
35.	27.	After Heb. vi. 7. add, See alſo Mat. xxvii. 48. Mark xv. 36.
55.	13.	for XX. read 21.
86.	30.	for Synopſin, read Synopſis.
89.	13.	for Curac, read Curæ.
283.		Margin: for 107, read 115.
285.	20.	for doctrince, read doctrine.
323.	21.	for μαθητευσα, read μαθητευσατε.
363.	8.	for turn, read return.
394.	29.	for No 13, read No 12.
456.	2.	Note: for connections, read connection.
470.	6.	for at, read as.

In a few Weeks will be published, Price Bound 3s. 6d.

A New Edition of,

THE REIGN OF GRACE.

By A. BOOTH.

Sold by J. BUCKLAND, Pater Noſter Row; C. DILLY in the Poultry; and W. GRAY, Edinburgh.

Lately published, Price 1s. 6d. Stitched,

By the ſame Author,

THE DEATH OF LEGAL HOPE, THE LIFE OF EVANGELICAL OBEDIENCE.

The Second Edition.

Sold by J. JOHNSON, St. Paul's Church Yard.

BAPTIST 20 AL. 85 MUSEUM

AN APOLOGY FOR THE BAPTISTS.

Price 1s. Stitched. And,

Dr. ABBADIE's DEITY OF CHRIST ESSENTIAL TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Price Bound 3s. 6d.

Sold by J. BUCKLAND, J. JOHNSON, and C. DILLY.

PÆDOBAPTISM EXAMINED, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the Nature, Obligation, and Importance of POSITIVE INSTITUTIONS *in Religion.*

BP. BUTLER: "Moral precepts, are precepts the reaſons of which we ſee; poſitive precepts, are precepts the reaſons of which we do not ſee. Moral duties ariſe out of the nature of the caſe itſelf, prior to external command; poſitive duties do not ariſe out of the nature of the caſe, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for ſuch command, received from Him whoſe creatures and ſubjects we are. But the manner in which the nature of the caſe, or the fact of the relation, is made known, this doth not denominate any duty either poſitive or moral——The reaſon of poſitive inſtitutions, in general, is very obvious; though we ſhould not ſee the reaſon why ſuch par-

ticular ones are pitched upon, rather than others. Whoever, therefore, inſtead of cavilling at words, will attend to the thing itſelf, may clearly ſee, that poſitive inſtitutions in general, as diſtinguiſhed from this or that particular one, have the nature of moral commands; ſince the reaſons of them appear. Thus, for inſtance, the *external* worſhip of God, is a moral duty, though no particular mode of it be ſo. Care, then, is to be taken, when a compariſon is made between poſitive and moral duties, that they be compared no farther than as they are *different*; no farther than as the former are *poſitive*, or ariſing out of mere external command, the reaſons of which we are not acquainted with: and as the latter are *moral*, or ariſing out of the apparent reaſon of the caſe, without ſuch external command. Unleſs this caution be obſerved, we ſhall run into endleſs confuſion. Now this being premiſed, ſuppoſe two ſtanding precepts injoined by the ſame authority; that in certain conjunctures it is impoſſible to obey them both; that the former is moral, *i. e.* a precept of which we ſee the reaſons, and that they hold in the particular caſe before us; but the latter is poſitive, *i. e.* a precept of which we do not ſee the reaſons: it is indiſputable that our obligations are to obey the *former*, becauſe there is an apparent reaſon for this preference, and none againſt it——As it is one of the peculiar weakneſſes of human nature, when, upon a compariſon of two things, one is found to be of *greater* importance than the other, to conſider this other as of ſcarce *any* importance at all; it is highly neceſſary that we remind ourſelves *how great preſumption* it is, to make light of *any* inſtitution of divine appointment; that our obligations to obey *all* God's commands whatever, are abſolute and indiſpenſible;

penſible; and that commands *merely poſitive*, admitted to be from Him, lay us under a *moral obligation* to obey them, an obligation moral in the *ſtricteſt* and *moſt proper* ſenſe." *Analogy of Relig.* p. 172—178. Glaſgow, 1764.

2. Dr. J. G. KING: "Poſitive duties, having no obligation in the reaſon of things, can have no foundation but in the *expreſs words* of the inſtitutor, from which alone they derive their authority." *Rites and Cerem. of the Greek Church in Ruſſia*, p. 12.

3. Mr. JONATHAN EDWARDS: Poſitive "precepts are the greateſt and moſt proper trial of obedience; becauſe in them the mere authority and will of the legiſlator, is the *ſole ground* of the obligation, and nothing in the natures of the things themſelves; and therefore they are the greateſt trial of any perſon's reſpect to that authority and will." *Diſcourſes on Import. Sub.* p. 68. Boſton, 1738.

4. Bp. BURNET: "Sacraments are *poſitive* precepts, which are to be meaſured ONLY *by the inſtitution*, in which there is not room left for us to carry them any further." *Expoſit.* XXXIX *Articles*, Art. XXVII. p. 279. Edit. 5.

5. Mr. STEELE: "Sacraments depend merely upon their *inſtitution*: hence doth their being reſult, and upon this their matter and ſignification do depend. The inſtitution, with the elements, makes the ſacrament; and ſo the *only* rule and balance for them muſt needs be their inſtitution." *Morning Exerciſe againſt Pop.* Serm. XXII. p. 764, 765.

6. STAPFERUS: "Viſible ſigns are the matter of ſacraments.——Signs are either *natural* or *arbitrary*. Sacred ceremonies are of the *latter* kind. But whatever an arbitrary ſign be, it is ſuch by *inſtitution*." *Inſtitut.*

Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem. Tom. I. Cap. III. §. 1623, 1624.

7. * Dr. GROSVENOR: "The diminutive things that have been ſaid by ſome of the poſitive appointments in religion, and the extravagant things that have been ſaid by others, are two extremes which true reaſoning leads no body into, on either hand. It is as contrary to the nature of things to make *nothing* of them, as to make them *the whole* of religion. To know exactly the regard that is due to them, is to find out the rank and order they are placed in, by Him who has appointed them —— I ſhall lay together what I have to ſay on this ſubject, under the following propoſitions.

"PROPOSITION I. Some things are *abſolutely neceſſary* to ſalvation, and in their own nature. We call thoſe things abſolutely neceſſary, without which there can be no ſalvation at all. Thus, a mind ſuited to the happineſs intended by the word *ſalvation*, is abſolutely neceſſary; or holineſs, *without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord*—— All the titles in the world to heaven, can never give the pleaſure of heaven, without a ſuitableneſs to its enjoyments. Fitneſs, here, is as the eye, to the delights of colours and proſpects; the ear to the pleaſures of harmony; and as the palate, to thoſe of taſte and reliſh: that is, a capacity of enjoyment. As there muſt be an animal nature, for animal pleaſures; a rational nature, for the rational ones; ſo there muſt be the divine and heavenly nature, for thoſe that are divine and heavenly. No man would care to live even with a GOD whom he did not love.

"PROP.

* Anonymous, indeed, but ſuppoſed to be Dr. BENJ. GROSVENOR.

" PROP. II. No *merely poſitive* appointments are neceſſary in this ſenſe; *i. e.* abſolutely and in their own nature —— If there never had been a ſacrament in the world, I might have been happy without it: you cannot ſay ſo of love to God and likeneſs to him ——

" PROP. III. A *diſpoſition* to obey divine orders, wherever they are diſcerned, either poſitive or moral, is part of that *holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord.* I may be ſaved without a ſacrament; but I cannot be ſaved without a diſpoſition to obey God's authority wherever I ſee it. A ſacrament is a poſitive rite, and not to be compared with moral virtue; but is not a diſpoſition to obey God's order, *moral virtue*, and *Chriſtian grace?* Or can there be any moral virtue, or Chriſtian grace, without a diſpoſition to obey the authority of Chriſt, wherever I diſcern it? Surely, obedience to God's command is a moral excellence, though the inſtances of that obedience may lie in poſitive rites. The command to Abraham, to ſacrifice his ſon, was a poſitive order, and a very ſtrange one too; ſeemingly oppoſite to ſome moral orders given out before: and yet his diſpoſition to obey, when he was ſure of a divine warrant in the caſe, has ſet him as the head of all the believing world; as the heroe of faith, the father of the faithful, and the friend of God. The command of ſprinkling the blood of the paſſover upon the door-poſts of the Iſraelites, was an external poſitive rite; if there had not been a diſpoſition to obey that order, it would have coſt ſome lives; as it had like to have done to Moſes, the neglect of circumciſing his child, as good a man as he was in other reſpects. Was not the forbidden fruit, a *poſitive* inſtance? an *external* thing? Setting aſide

aſide the divine prohibition, there was nothing immoral in eating of that, any more than of any other tree; but diſobedience is an *immorality*, let the inſtance be what it will.

" PROP. IV. The ſincerity and truth of ſuch a diſpoſition, is beſt known by its being *uniform* and *univerſal*. Pſal. cxix. 6. Col. iv. 3. The Author of our religion has told us, and added his example to his word, That *thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteouſneſs*, and ſo ordered himſelf to be baptized.—— Baptiſm was a poſitive rite, an external thing; and yet he calls it *righteouſneſs*. Such righteouſneſs as became Him who was the Holy One of God; became Him who had intrinſically no need of any outward ceremony; whoſe inward purity was perfectly divine: and if it became Him to *fulfil* ſuch ſort of righteouſneſs, it can hardly become any, who pretend to be his followers, to *neglect* it.——

" PROP. V. As a competent evidence is ſuppoſed needful, for any external rite being of divine appointment; ſo again, a *wilful ignorance* of that evidence, *or not diſcerning it*, through criminal cauſes, will not excuſe from guilt. The criminal cauſes of not ſeeing the evidence for ſuch appointments, are, in this caſe, as in many other caſes, *non-inquiry*, *lazineſs*, *prejudice*, *luſt*, *pride*, and *paſſion*. That an ignorance owing to theſe cauſes, cannot be pleaded for a neglect of any of God's appointments, is ſo much the general ſenſe of all caſuiſts, that I ſhall only add here, THAT IT IS AT EVERY MAN'S PERIL, HOW HE COMES NOT TO KNOW THE WILL OF GOD, AS WELL AS NOT TO DO IT—— We muſt look to it, how we came not to ſee the appointment, and muſt anſwer that to God and our own

own conſcience. It is not enough to ſay, *Lord, I did not know it was appointed*; when the anſwer may juſtly be, *You never enquired into the matter: you never allowed yourſelf to think of it: Or if you did, you reſolved in your mind, that you would not be convinced. You made the moſt of every cavil, but never minded the ſolution to any of your objections.*

"PROP. VI. The duty and neceſſity of any external rites, and particularly of ſacraments, have their *meaſures* and *degrees*. And here I apprehend, the meaſures of the duty and neceſſity of ſacraments, to be—The *authority* injoining. When we ſee the broad ſeal of heaven, where there is the divine warrant, *Thus ſaith the Lord*; it is worſe than trifling, to cavil and ſay, *It is but an external rite*——The *degree* of evidence, of their being ſo appointed. Where the evidence is not ſo clear, the obligation is weakened in proportion; but where the terms are plainly binding, and ſtrongly commanding, there the obligation is not to be evaded——When poſitive appointments and moral duties *cannot* be both performed; when the one or the other *muſt* be omitted; the preference is given to the moral and ſpiritual duty——The *ſtreſs* God lays upon them for the time they are to continue. *Sprinkling the blood* of the paſſover upon the poſts of the doors, was not at all neceſſary in itſelf to preſervation from the deſtroying angel; but God laid that ſtreſs upon it. The *oracle*, or the mercy ſeat, was a mere poſitive appointment. God could have met Moſes any where elſe; but God laying that ſtreſs upon it, meaſures the degree of the neceſſity of obſerving that order; *There will I meet thee, and commune with thee*, Exod. xxv. 22. Moſes might have reaſoned with himſelf; *God is every where, and can meet*

meet me any where, if he pleaſes; and if he does not pleaſe, he won't do it here: and ſo have miſſed the honour of communion with his Maker; broke the divine order; loſt the benefit of the oracle; and offended God, by the neglect——The *reaſon* and *end* of them. If there ſhould be any reaſons of theſe injunctions that we do not know, it is ſufficient that they are known to God. Our obedience is always a *reaſonable ſervice*, whether we know God's reaſons for the injunction, or no. His *command* is always reaſon enough for us——

"PROP. VII. He that commands the outward poſitive rite, commands the *inward* and *moral temper* at the ſame time. He does not ſay, *Do this*,—without concerning himſelf *how* it is done; whether in a manner ſuitable to an end appointed, or not—— There is no ſuch command of his, as injoins the outward act, without the inward temper and diſpoſition.

"PROP. VIII. Poſitive appointments for ſuch uſes and ends as theſe, are of a quite different nature from *arbitrary impoſitions*; with which they are too often confounded. The idea of *arbitrary*, I think, implies a weakneſs incompatible to the divine nature; whoſe perfection it is, to do nothing but for ſome wiſe reaſon, and for ſome good end.——

"PROP. IX. Though no poſitive appointments are abſolutely neceſſary, yet the contempt of them, and of the divine authority diſcerned in them, cannot conſiſt with holineſs. This contempt may be ſhewn—by, contemptuous *language*—a *careleſs* attendance—a total *neglect*—and by proſtituting them to *perſons* that do contemn them, and to *purpoſes* that are unworthy.——

"To conclude: External rites are nothing without the inward temper and virtue of mind; the inward

ward temper is but pretended to, in many caſes, without the external rites, and is acquired, promoted, and evidenced by the uſe of them. *If I give all my goods to the poor, and have not charity*; there's the external act, without the inward moral temper, and ſo it is all *nothing*. If, on the other hand, I ſay, I have the inward temper of charity, and give nothing to the poor, but ſay to my brother; *Be thou warmed—Be thou cloathed*—how dwelleth the love of God in that man? Therefore, what God hath joined together, let no man put aſunder. Whatever comparative excellence there may be in the two different inſtances of obedience, they are *both* inſtances of obedience; and the direction of our regard is ſummed up in that text, Matt. xxiii. 23. *Theſe ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.*" *The Moral Obligation to the Poſitive Appointments in Relig.* paſſim. Lond. 1732.

8. Bp. HOADLY: "I. The partaking of the Lord's ſupper is not a duty of itſelf; or a duty apparent to us from the nature of things; but a duty made ſuch to Chriſtians, by the poſitive inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt.

"II. All poſitive duties, or duties made ſuch by *inſtitution* alone, depend entirely upon the will and declaration of the perſon who inſtitutes or ordains them, with reſpect to the real *deſign* and *end* of them; and conſequently to the due *manner* of performing them. For, there being no other foundation for them with regard to *us*, but the will of the *inſtitutors*; this will muſt of neceſſity be our ſole direction, both as to our underſtanding their true intent, and practiſing them accordingly: becauſe we can have no other direction in this ſort of duties, unleſs we will have re-

courſe to *mere invention*; which makes them *our own* inſtitutions, and not the inſtitutions of thoſe who firſt appointed them.

" III. It is plain, therefore, that the *nature*, the *deſign*, and the due *manner* of partaking of the Lord's ſupper, muſt of neceſſity depend upon what Jeſus Chriſt, who inſtituted it, hath declared about it.

" IV. It cannot be doubted, that he himſelf ſufficiently declared to his firſt and immediate followers the whole of what he deſigned ſhould be underſtood by it, or implied in it. For this being a poſitive inſtitution depending entirely upon *his* will; and not deſigned to contain any thing in it, but what he himſelf ſhould pleaſe to affix to it; it muſt follow that he declared his mind about it, *fully* and *plainly*: becauſe otherwiſe, he muſt be ſuppoſed to inſtitute a duty, of which no one could have any notion without his inſtitution; and at the ſame time not to inſtruct his followers ſufficiently what that duty was to be.

" V. It is of ſmall importance, therefore, to Chriſtians to know what the many writers upon this ſubject, ſince the time of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, have affirmed. Much leſs can it be the duty of Chriſtians to be guided by what any perſons, by their own authority, or from their own imaginations, may teach concerning this duty. The reaſon is plain: becauſe in the matter of an *inſtituted duty* (or a duty made ſo by the poſitive will of any perſon) no one can be a judge, but the inſtitutor himſelf, of what he deſigned ſhould be contained in it; and becauſe, ſuppoſing him not to have ſpoken his mind plainly about it, it is impoſſible that any other perſon (to whom the inſtitutor himſelf never revealed his deſign) ſhould make up that defect. All that is added, therefore,

therefore, to Christ's institution, as a necessary part of it, ought to be esteemed only as the *invention* of those who add it: and the more there is added (let it be done with never so much solemnity, and never so great pretences to authority) the less there is remaining of the *simplicity* of the institution, as Christ himself left it.——

"VI. The passages in the *New Testament*, which relate to this duty, and they *alone* are the original accounts of the *nature* and *end* of this institution; and the only authentic declarations, upon which we of later ages can safely depend." *Works*, Vol. III. p. 845, 846, 847.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It seems to be the unanimous opinion of these learned Pædobaptists, that positive institutions originate in the divine *pleasure*, and derive their whole being from the *sovereign will* of God. The revealed will of God, therefore, gave them their existence under every dispensation of true religion. Consequently, we cannot know any thing about their precise nature, their true design, the proper subjects of them, or the right mode of their administration, further than the Scriptures teach: for "they are to be measured *only* by the institution, in which there is not room left for us to carry them any further." See No. 4. 8.

REFLECT. II. It follows, therefore, from the nature of the case, that positive ordinances must be intirely under the direction of *positive precepts*, or of *examples* in the Scripture, that are warranted by the Holy Spirit. For, as Dr. GOODWIN observes, "There is this difference between doctrinal truths and

and inſtitutions, that one *truth* may be, by reaſon, better fetched out of another, and more ſafely and eaſily, than *inſtitutions*. For one truth begets another, and truth is infinite in the conſequences of it; but ſo inſtitutions *are not*. And the reaſon of the difference is this; becauſe they depend upon a *promiſe*, and upon the *power* and *will* of God, immediately to concur with them, and ſet them up. They are things that are ſingled out by the will of God, to a ſpiritual end, with a ſpiritual efficacy. We may be aſſured what is an inſtitution of God, by examples which we meet with in the Scriptures: for one way by which Chriſt was pleaſed to convey his inſtitutions to us, is by way of examples in the New Teſtament; without the which, being intended as a rule for us, we acknowledge that a complete rule for all things could not be made forth—If an example be written as a *rule*, then it will bind, becauſe there is no ſuppoſition of error." *

It does not appear from the records of the Old Teſtament, that, when Jehovah appointed any branch of ritual worſhip, he left either the ſubjects of it, or the mode of adminiſtration, to be inferred by the people, either from the *relation* in which they ſtood to himſelf; or from general *moral* precepts; or from any branch of his *moral* worſhip; nor yet from any other well known *poſitive* rite: but he gave them *ſpecial* directions relating to the *very caſe*, and thoſe directions they were bound to regard, whether they appeared in a pleaſing or a painful, in a decent or a diſguſting light. For as nothing but the Divine will can oblige the conſcience, and as that will cannot be known, unleſs revealed; ſo, when made known, whether

* *Works*, Vol. iv. *Government of the Church of Chriſt*, Chap. iv. p. 21, 22.

whether in reference to moral or poſitive duties, it muſt oblige. For we are bound to regard the Divine laws, not ſo much on account of what they are in themſelves, however excellent; as becauſe they are *the will of* HIM whoſe claim of obedience is prior to every other conſideration. Conſequently, ſeeing baptiſm is as really and intirely a poſitive inſtitution, as any that were given to the choſen tribes; we cannot with ſafety infer either the mode, or the ſubject of it, from any thing ſhort of a *precept*, or a *precedent*, recorded in Scripture, and relating to that very ordinance.

REFLECT. III. It ſeems natural hence to infer, that our ſovereign Lord muſt have revealed his will concerning the ordinance of baptiſm, in a manner proportional to its obligation and importance. See No. 8. For, as an appointment of Chriſt, it originated in his will, and from a revelation of that will the whole of its obligation reſults. In proportion, therefore, as we annex the idea of *obſcurity* to what he ſays about the mode and the ſubject of it; we either *ſink* the idea of obligation to regard it, or *impeach* the wiſdom, or the goodneſs, or the equity, of our divine Legiſlator: for we neither have, nor *can* have any acquaintance with a poſitive inſtitution, further than it is *revealed*; and a *natural* incapacity will always excuſe the non-performance of what would otherwiſe be an indiſpenſible duty. We are, therefore, obliged to conclude, that our Lord has clearly revealed his pleaſure, with reference to this appointment, in that code of law and rule of religious worſhip, which he gave to the church in the volume of the New Teſtament. See. No. 8.

REFLECT. IV. It appears from the authors produced, that none are worthy the name of Chriſtians, who

who are deſtitute of a *diſpoſition* to acknowledge the authority of Chriſt in his poſitive appointments, by a ſubmiſſion to them; and, that ignorance of their nature, obligation, and uſe, is far from excuſing, except it ariſe from *natural* incapacity, and not from a bad ſtate of the will. The morality of our conduct does not depend on the underſtanding; for our knowing, or being ignorant of a thing, is not the reaſon of its being good, or evil: any more than the nature of an action does upon the will; becauſe the willing a bad action to a good end, cannot render it innocent.—Now in regard to baptiſm, we have not only the command of our Lord, but his own *example* alſo, to inforce our obſervance of it; concerning which, Mr. WESLEY very properly ſays: "Let our Lord's ſubmitting to baptiſm, teach us an holy *exactneſs* in the obſervance of thoſe inſtitutions which owe their obligation merely to a divine command. Surely, *thus it becometh* all his followers *to fulfil all righteouſneſs*."* To which obſervation I may add the reaſoning of Dr. GERARD, who ſays; "A total diſregard to the poſitive and external duties of religion, or a very great neglect of them, is juſtly reckoned more blamable, and a ſtronger evidence of an unprincipled character, than even ſome tranſgreſſions of moral obligation——Even particular poſitive precepts, as ſoon as they are given by God, have ſomething *moral* in their nature. Suppoſe the rites which are enjoined by them, perfectly indifferent before they were enjoined; yet from that moment they ceaſe to be indifferent. The divine authority is interpoſed for the obſervance of them. To neglect them is no longer to forbear an indifferent action, or to do a thing in one way rather than another, which has naturally

* *Note*, on Matt. iii. 16.

naturally no greater propriety: it is very different; it is to diſobey God, it is to deſpiſe his authority, it is to reſiſt his will. Can any man believe a God, and nōt acknowledge that diſobedience to him and contempt of his authority is *immoral*, and far from the leaſt heinous ſpecies of immorality?—All poſitive inſtitutions of divine appointment, are *means* of cultivating moral virtue. Be the rites themſelves what they will, their being enjoined by God, renders them proper trials of our obedience to him, and renders our obſervance of them the means of cheriſhing a ſenſe of his authority, and of improving a principle of ſubjection to it. A principle of ſubjection to the authority of God, is one of the firmeſt ſupports of all goodneſs and virtue: and poſitive inſtitutions are the moſt direct means of cultivating it; for the obſervance of them proceeds ſolely from the principle of obedience; but in every moral virtue, other principles are conjoined with this. All the rites appointed by God, are likewiſe direct and very powerful means of improving many particular virtuous affections, all the affections which are naturally exerciſed in performing them. Neglect of the *means* demonſtrates, in every caſe, indifference about the *end*. Diſregard to external worſhip and poſitive inſtitutions, ſhews the want of all concern for moral improvement. But unconcern for moral improvement is not the defect of a ſingle virtue, is not a ſingle vice; it is a corruption and degeneracy of the *whole ſoul*, and therefore muſt appear highly deteſtable to every perſon of ſound and unbiaſſed judgment—It is not they who reckon a regard to poſitive inſtitutions eſſential to a good and unblemiſhed character, that judge weakly, but they who reckon that regard of no importance. Vain are their pretenſions

to

to enlargement of ſentiment and elevation above prejudice; their minds are ſo contracted, that they can admit only a partial idea of the nature of poſitive duties; they conſider but the mere matter of them; they comprehend not their moral principles, their ſublime end, or their important ſignification."*

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Signification of the Terms, BAPTIZE, *and* BAPTISM.

N. B. To obviate miſtakes, the reader is deſired to obſerve, that many of the following quotations are to be conſidered as *conceſſions*, made by theſe learned authors; no inconſiderable part of them aſſerting, notwithſtanding what they here ſay, that the word *baptiſm* ſignifies *pouring* and *ſprinkling*, as well as *immerſion*.

WITSIUS: "It cannot be denied, that the native ſignification of the word βαπτειν and βαπτιζειν, is, *to plunge, to dip*." *OEconom. Foed.* L. iv. C. xvi. § 13.

2. SALMASIUS: "*Baptiſm*, is *immerſion*; and was adminiſtered, in ancient times, according to the force and meaning of the word. Now it is only *rhantiſm*, or *ſprinkling*; not *immerſion*, or *dipping*." *De Cæſarie Virorum*, p. 669.

3. GURTLERUS: "*To baptize*, among the Greeks, is, undoubtedly, to *immerſe*, to *dip*; and *baptiſm*,

* *Sermons*, Vol. I. p. 312—314, 316, 317, 320. Edit. 2d.

baptiſm, is *immerſion*, *dipping*. Βαπτισμος εν Πνευματι αγιῳ, *baptiſm in the Holy Spirit*, is *immerſion* into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit; or a rich and abundant communication of his gifts: for he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out, is, as it were, *immerſed* into him.——Βαπτισμος εν πυρι, *baptiſm in fire*, is a figurative expreſſion, and ſignifies *the caſting into a flame*, which, like water, flows far and wide; ſuch as the flame that conſumed Jeruſalem.—The thing commanded by our Lord, is *baptiſm*; *immerſion* into water." *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Cap. xxxiii. § 108, 109, 110, 115.

4. Mr. SAMUEL DAVIES: "He [Chriſt] had a baptiſm to be baptized with; *a baptiſm, an immerſion*, in tears and blood." *Sermons*, Vol. ii. p. 169. Edit. 3d.

5. Dr. BENTLEY: "Βαπτισμους *baptiſms, dippings* —Βαπτισον σεαυτον εις θαλασσαν, *dip* yourſelf in the ſea." *Remarks on Diſc. on Free Thinking*, Part II. p. 56, 57. Edit. 6.

6. Bp. REYNOLDS: "The Spirit, under the goſpel, is compared—to water; and that not a little meaſure, to *ſprinkle*, or *bedew*, but to *baptize* the faithful in, Matt. iii. 11. Acts i. 5. and that not in a font, or veſſel, which grows leſs and leſs, but in a *ſpring*, or *living river*, Joh. vii. 39." *Works*, p. 226.

7. CALVIN: "The word *baptize*, ſignifies *to immerſe*; and the rite of immerſion was obſerved by the ancient church." *Inſtitut. Chriſt. Relig.* L. iv. C. xv. § 20.

8. BEZA: "Chriſt commanedd us to be *baptized*; by which word, it is certain, *immerſion* is ſignified—Βαπτιζεσθαι, in this place, is more than χερνιπτειν; for the *former* ſeems to reſpect the whole body, the *latter* only the hands. Nor does Βαπτιζειν ſignify to *waſh*, except by conſequence: for it properly ſignifies *to immerſe*

immerſe for the ſake of dipping." *Epiſtola* II. ad THOM. TILIUM, apud SPANHEM. *Dub. Evang.* Pars III. Dub. 24. *Annotat.* in Marc. vii. 4.

9. SPANHEMIUS: "Βαπτιζειν, and Βαπτειν, are generally found uſed for *plunging*, or *a total dipping*." *Dub. Evang.* Pars III. Dub. xxiv. § 2.

10. VITRINGA: "The act of baptizing, is the *immerſion* of believers in water. This expreſſes the force of the word. Thus alſo it was performed by Chriſt and the Apoſtles." *Aphoriſmi Sanct. Theolog.* Aphoriſ. 884.

11. BECKMANUS: "Baptiſm, according to the force of its etymology, is *immerſion*, and waſhing, or dipping." *Exercit. Theolog.* Exercit. xvii. p. 257.

12. BUCANUS: "*Baptiſm*, that is, *immerſion*, *dipping*, and, by conſequence, *waſhing*. *Baptiſtry*, a vat, or large veſſel of wood, or ſtone, in which we are *immerſed*, for the ſake of waſhing. *Baptiſt*, one that *immerſes*, or *dips*." *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Loc. XLVII. Quæſt. I. p. 605.

13. BP. PATRICK: "I may ſay of him (Mr. JOHN SMITH) in ANTONINUS his phraſe, he was δικαιοσυνη βεβαμμενος εις βαθος, DIP'D *into juſtice*, as it were, *over head and ears*; he had not a ſlight ſuperficial tincture, but was dyed and coloured quite through with it." *Funeral Serm.* for Mr. J. SMITH of Cambridge, ſubjoined to his *Select Diſcourſes*, p. 509.

14. ZANCHIUS: "*Baptiſm* is a Greek word, and ſignifies two things: firſt, and properly, *immerſion* in water. For the proper ſignification of Βαπτιζω, is to *immerſe*, *to plunge under*, *to overwhelm* in water.—And *this* ſignification properly agrees with our baptiſm, and has a reſemblance of the thing ſignified." *Opera*, Tom. VI. *in Epiſt. ad Epheſ.* p. 217.

15. HOORN-

15. HOORNBEEKIUS: "We do not deny, that the word *baptiſm* bears the ſenſe of *immerſion*; or that, in the firſt examples of perſons baptized, they went into the water and were *immerſed*; or that this rite *ſhould be obſerved*, where it may be done conveniently and without indangering health." *Socin. Confut.* L. III. C. II. Sect. I. Tom. III. p. 268.

16. STAPFERUS: "By *baptiſm*, we underſtand that rite of the New Teſtament church, commanded by Chriſt, in which believers, by being *immerſed* in water, teſtify their communion with the church." *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. III. § 1635.

17. BURMANNUS: "Βαπτισμος and βαπτισμα, if you conſider their etymology, properly ſignify *immerſion*. *And Jeſus, when he was baptized, went up ſtraightway out of the water.* Matt. iii. 16. Compare Acts viii. 38." *Synopſ. Theolog.* Tom. II. Loc. XLIII. Cap. vi. § 2.

18. ROELL: "Baptiſm, from βαπτω, ſignifies *immerſion*." *Explicat. Epiſt. ad Epheſios*, ad Cap. iv. 5.

19. Mr. JOHN TRAPP: "*Are ye able to——be baptized with the baptiſm*; or *plunged* over head and ears in the deep waters of affliction?" *Comment.* on Matt. xx. 22.

20. LIMBORCH: "Baptiſm is that rite, or ceremony, of the New Covenant, whereby the faithful, by *immerſion* into water, as by a ſacred pledge, are aſſured of the favour of God, remiſſion of ſins, and eternal life; and by which they engage themſelves to an amendment of life, and an obedience to the divine commands." *Compleat Syſt. Div.* B. V. Chap. XXII. Sect. I. Mr. JONES's Tranſlation.

21. H. ALTINGIUS: "The word *baptiſm*—— properly ſignifies *immerſion*; improperly, by a metonymy

tonymy of the end, *washing*." *Loci Commun.* Pars I. Loc. XII. p. 198.

22. HOSPINIANUS: "Christ commanded us to be *baptized*; by which word, *it is certain*, *immersion* is signified." *Hist. Sacram.* L. II. C. I. p. 30.

23. CASAUBONUS: "This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were *plunged* into the water; which even the very word βαπτιζειν, to baptize, sufficiently declares——Whence we understand, that, what some have disputed concerning the immersion of the whole body in baptism, is not impertinent; for they urge the word, *baptize*." *In Matt.* iii. 6.

24. LUTHER: "The term *baptism*, is a Greek word. It may be rendered *a dipping*, when we dip something in water, that it may be intirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they intirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water;) nevertheless they ought to be *wholly immersed*, and presently to be drawn out again. For the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *Tauff*, from *depth*, which they call *Tieff*, in their language; as if it were proper those should be *deeply immersed*, who are baptized. And, truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required: for it signifies that the old man and our nativity, that is full of sins, which is intirely of flesh and blood, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The *manner* of baptism, therefore, should correspond to the *signification* of baptism, that it may shew a certain and plain sign of it." *Opera*, Tom. I. fol. 71. Wittenburg. in Dr. DU VEIL on Acts viii. 38.

25. J. G. SCHELHORNIUS: "To be *baptized*, properly signifies to be *immersed*, or *plunged* under water." *Biblioth. Bremens.* Class. VII. p. 637.

26. Mr.

26. Mr. SELDEN: "In England, of late years, I ever thought the parſon *baptized his own fingers*, rather than the child." *Works*, Vol. VI. Col. 2008.

27. KECKERMANNUS: "We cannot deny, that the firſt inſtitution of baptiſm conſiſted in *immerſion*, and not *ſprinkling*; which is quite evident from Rom. vi. 3, 4." *Syſtem. Theolog.* L. III. C. VIII. p. 369.

28. Dr. TOWERSON: "The third thing to be enquired concerning the outward viſible ſign of baptiſm is, how it ought to be applied;——whether—by an *immerſion*,—or an *aſperſion*, or *effuſion*——A more material queſtion [this] than it is commonly deemed by us, who have been accuſtomed to baptize by a bare effuſion, or ſprinkling of water upon the party. For in things which depend for their force upon the mere will and pleaſure of him who inſtituted them, there ought, no doubt, great regard to be had to the commands of him who did ſo; as without which there is no reaſon to preſume we ſhall receive the benefit of that ceremony, to which he hath been pleaſed to annex it. Now, what the command of Chriſt was in this particular, cannot well be doubted of by thoſe who ſhall conſider the words of Chriſt, Matt. xxviii. 19. concerning it, and the practice of thoſe times, whether in the baptiſm of John, or of our Saviour. For the words of Chriſt are, that they ſhould *baptize*, or *dip*, thoſe whom they made diſciples to him (for ſo, *no doubt*, the word βαπτιζειν properly ſignifies; and which is more, and not without its weight, that they ſhould baptize them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Thereby intimating ſuch a waſhing, as ſhould receive the party baptized within the very body of the water, which they were to baptize him with. Though, if there could be any

any doubt concerning the ſignification of the words in themſelves, yet would that doubt be removed by conſidering the practice of thoſe times, whether in the baptiſm of John, or of our Saviour. For ſuch as was the *practice* of thoſe times in baptizing, ſuch in reaſon are we to think our Saviour's *command* to have been concerning it, eſpecially when the words themſelves incline that way: there being not otherwiſe any means, either for thoſe, or future times, to diſcover his intention concerning it." *Of the Sacram. Bap.* Part III. p. 53, 54, 55.

29. BOSSUET: "To *baptize* ſignifies to *plunge*, as is granted by all the world." In Mr. STENNETT, *againſt* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 174.

30. SUICERUS: "He is ſaid, βαπτειν ὑδριαν, *to baptize a bucket*, who draws water out of a well, or a river; which cannot be done, except the bucket be *intirely plunged* under the water. Wool and cloaths are ſaid to be βαπτισθαι, *baptized*, when they are *dipped*; becauſe they are quite immerſed in the dying fat, that they may imbibe the colour. Βαπτιζω, *to baptize*, hath properly the ſame ſignification—— Βαπτιζειν ἑαυτον εις θαλασσαν, in the ancient Poet, is, *to plunge himſelf into the ſea*.——From the proper ſignification of the verb, *baptize*, *baptiſm* properly denotes *immerſion*, or *dipping into*." *Theſaurus Eccleſ.* ſub voce Βαπτισμα.

31. VENEMA: "The word βαπτιζειν, *to baptize*— is no where uſed in the Scripture for *ſprinkling*; no not in Mark vii. 4. otherwiſe than appears to ſome." *Inſtitut. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Vet. et Nov. Teſt.* Tom. III. Secul. I. § 138.

32. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS: "The word βαπτιζω, *to baptize*, which ſignifies *immerſion* into water, proves, that the adminiſtrator of baptiſm *immerſed*,

immerſed, or waſhed, the perſons baptized, in water." *Cent.* I. L. II. C. VI. p. 382.

33. Mr. DANIEL ROGERS: "None, of *old*, were wont to be *ſprinkled*; and I confeſs myſelf unconvinced by demonſtration of Scripture for infants ſprinkling. It ought to be the church's part to cleave to the inſtitution, which is *dipping*; and he betrays the church, whoſe officer he is, to a diſorderly error, if he cleave not to the inſtitution, which is to *dip*. That the miniſter is to dip in water, as the meeteſt act, the word βαπτιζω notes it. For the Greeks wanted not other words to expreſs any other act beſides dipping, if the inſtitution could bear it. What reſemblance of the *burial* or the *reſurrection* of Chriſt is in ſprinkling? *All antiquity and ſcripture* confirm that way. To dip, therefore, is *exceeding material* to the ordinance; which was the uſage of old, without exception of countries, hot, or cold." *Treatiſe of the two Sac.* Part I. Chap. V. and VIII. in Dr. RUSSEL'S *Juſt Vind. of Doc. and Prac. of John*, &c. *Epiſt. Dedicat.* p. 5.

34. Dr. HAMMOND: "The word here uſed βαπτιζεσθαι (as it differs from νιπτισθαι verſe 3.) ſignifies not only the waſhing of the *whole body* (as when 'tis ſaid of EUPOLIS—that being taken and thrown into the ſea, εβαπτιζετο, he was *immerſed* all over, and ſo the baptiſms of cups, &c. in the end of this verſe, is putting into *water all over*, rinſing them) but waſhing any part as the hands here, by way of *immerſion* in water, as that is oppoſed to affuſion or pouring water on them." *Annotations*, on Mark vii. 4.

35. IKENIUS: "The Greek word βαπτισμος, denotes the *immerſion* of a thing, or a perſon, into ſomething; either with a view to expiation, or for waſhing and cleanſing. Here alſo [Matt. iii. 11. compared with Luke iii. 16.] the *baptiſm of fire*, or that

that which is performed in fire, muſt ſignify, according to the ſame ſimplicity of the letter, an *immiſſion*, or *immerſion*, into fire for a ſimilar end: and this the rather, becauſe here, *to baptize in the Spirit*, and *in fire*, are not only connected, but alſo oppoſed to being baptized *in water*; and, therefore, the connection of the diſcourſe, and the laws of oppoſition demand, that after whatever manner theſe two phraſes denote baptiſm *in water*, and *in the Spirit*, to be performed, ſuch muſt that be which is performed *in fire*.——The Jewiſh rites of purification were different; for either they were performed by an *immerſion* of the whole body, which the Jews call טבילה, and the Greeks, βαπτισμον, *baptiſm*; or by the *waſhing* of ſome parts, as the hands, or the feet, which is called by the Greeks, νιψις; or by *ſprinkling*—which, in Greek, is denominated ῥαντισμος, *rhantiſm*." *Diſſert. Philolog. Theolog.* Diſſert. xix. p. 325. *Antiquit. Hebraicæ.* Pars I. C. XVIII. § 9.

36. DEYLINGIUS: "The word βαπτιζεσθαι, as uſed by Greek authors, ſignifies *immerſion* and *overwhelming*. Thus we read in PLUTARCH, *de Superſtit.* Tom. II. Op. f. 166. βαπτισον σεαυτον εις θαλασσαν, *dip yourſelf in the ſea*: like as Naaman, in 2 Kings v. 14. who BAPTIZED *himſelf ſeven times in Jordan*, which was an immerſion of the whole body. So STRABO, Lib. XIV. p. 458. when ſpeaking about the ſoldiers of ALEXANDER the Great, marching in the winter ſeaſon between Climax, a mountain in Pamphilia, and the ſea, ſays; *They were immerſed*, βαπτιζομενους, up to the middle. The ſame author, Lib. XII. p. 391. ſpeaking of Tatta, a marſh, ſituate between Galatia and Cappadocia, ſays; *The water riſes*, παντι τω βαπτισθεντι εις αυτο, *ſo as to overwhelm any thing*. DIODORUS SICULUS, Lib. I. C. XXXVI. when ſpeaking

ſpeaking of the Nile overflowing its banks, ſays; *Many of the land animals periſh,* υπο του ποταμου περιληφθεντα διαφθειρεσθαι βαπτιζομενα, *being overtaken and overwhelmed by the flood.* In JOSEPHUS, *Antiq. Iud.* Lib. XV. Cap. III. βαπτιζοντες, perſons *baptizing*, are perſons *plunging down.* It has the ſame ſignification in the Goſpels, and in the writings of the Apoſtles; if you except Luke xi. 38. where βαπτιζεσθαι ſeems to be uſed concerning waſhing the hands, which is done by ſprinkling." *Obſervat. Sac.* Pars III. Obſerv. XXVI. § 2. Lipſ. 1715.

37 HEIDEGGERUS: "The words βαπτισμα and βαπτισμος, *baptiſm*, (from βαπτειν, *to plunge, to immerſe*) properly ſignify *immerſion.*" *Corpus Theolog. Chriſt.* Loc. XXV. § XXI. Tom. II. p. 436.

38. J. J. WETSTENIUS: "To *baptize*, is to *plunge*, to dip. The body, or part of the body, being under water, is ſaid to be baptized." *Comment.* ad Matt. iii. 6.

39. Dr. DODDRIDGE: "I have, indeed,—a moſt dreadful baptiſm to be baptized with, and know that I ſhall ſhortly be *bathed*, as it were, in blood, and *plunged* in the moſt *overwhelming* diſtreſs." *Paraphraſe* on Luke xii. 50.

40. ZEPPERUS: "If we conſider the proper meaning of the term, the word *baptiſm* ſignifies *plunging* into water, or the *very act* of dipping and waſhing. It appears, therefore, from the very ſignification and etymology of the term, what was the cuſtom of adminiſtering baptiſm in the beginning; whereas we now, for *baptiſm*, rather have *rhantiſm*, or *ſprinkling.*" In LEIGH's *Crit. Sac.* under the word Βαπτισμος. Lond. 1646.

41. Mr. POOLE's CONTINUATORS: "To be baptized, is to be *dipped* in water; metaphorically, to be *plunged* in affliction. I am, ſaith Chriſt, to be

baptized with blood, *overwhelmed* with ſufferings and afflictions." *Annotations* on Matt. xx. 22.

42. WALAEUS: "The external form of baptiſm is *immerſion* into water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." *Enchiridium*, p. 425.

43. ARTICLES OF SMALCALD: "Baptiſm is no other than the word of God, with *plunging* into water, according to his appointment and command." KROMAYERI *Epitom. Lib. Concord. Chriſt.* p. 107.

44. ANONYMOUS: "That the *letter* of the ſcripture is in favour of the Baptiſts (or as they are ſtill *abſurdly* called, Anabaptiſts) cannot without evaſion and equivocation, be denied." *London Review*, for June 1776, p. 489.

45. ALSTEDIUS: "Βαπτιζειν, to baptize, ſignifies only to *immerſe*; not to *waſh*, except by conſequence." *Lexicon Theologicum*, Cap. XII. p. 221.

46. Mr. WILSON: "*To baptize*, to *dip* into water, or to *plunge* one into the water." *Chriſtian Dictionary*, Edit. 1661.

47. Mr. BAILEY: "Baptiſm, in ſtrictneſs of ſpeech, is that kind of ablution, or waſhing, which conſiſts in *dipping*; and when applied to the Chriſtian inſtitution, ſo called, it was uſed by the primitive Chriſtians in no other ſenſe than that of *dipping*; as the learned GROTIUS and CASAUBON well obſerve. But as *new cuſtoms* introduce *new ſignifications* of words, in proceſs of time it admitted the idea of *ſprinkling*, as in the caſe of clinical baptiſm." *Dictionary*, Dr. SCOTT's Edit. 1772.

48. Mr. LEIGH: "Βαπτιζω. The word *baptize*, though it be derived from βαπτω, to *dip*, or *plunge* into the water, and ſignifieth *primarily* ſuch a kind of waſhing as is uſed in bucks, where linen is *plunged*

plunged and *dipt*; yet it is taken more largely for any kind of waſhing, rinſing or cleanſing, even where there is no dipping at all; as Matt. iii. 11. and ſo on—The *native* and *proper* ſignification of it is, to *dip* into water, or to *plunge* under water, John iii. 22, 23. Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38." *Critica ſacra*, Edit. 1646.

49. Mr. PARKHURST: "Βαπτιζω (from βαπτω, to *dip*) to *dip*, *immerſe*, or *plunge* in water—*To baptize*, to *immerſe in*, or waſh with water—Figuratively; *to be baptized*, *immerſed*, or *plunged* in a flood, or ſea, as it were, of grievous afflictions and ſufferings."

50. SCHREVELIUS: "Βαπτιζω, *to baptize*, to *plunge*, to *waſh*." Cantab. 1685.

51. PASOR: "Βαπτιζω, *to baptize*, to *immerſe*, to *waſh*." *Lipſ.* 1735.

52. TROMMIUS: "Βαπτιζω, *to baptize*; to *immerſe*, to *dip*." *Concordantiæ Græcæ*, ſub voce.

53. MINTERT: "Βαπτιζω, *to baptize*; properly, indeed, it ſignifies to *plunge*, to *immerſe*, to *dip into water*: but becauſe it is common to plunge, or dip a thing, that it may be *waſhed*, hence alſo it ſignifies to *waſh*, to *waſh away*—Βαπτισμος, *baptiſm*; *immerſion*, *dipping into*; *waſhing*, *waſhing away*. *Properly*, and according to its etymology, it denotes that waſhing which is performed *by immerſion*."

54. SCAPULA: "Βαπτιζω, to baptize; to *dip*, or *immerſe*; as we immerſe any thing for the purpoſe of dying, or cleanſing in water. Alſo to *dip*, to *plunge*, to *overwhelm* in water. Likewiſe to waſh away, to waſh." Lond. 1652.

55. HEDERICUS: "Βαπτιζω, to baptize; to *plunge*, to *immerſe*, to *overwhelm* in water; to waſh away, to waſh. Βαπτισμα, baptiſm; *immerſion*, *dipping into*." Lond. 1778.

56. CON-

56. CONSTANTINUS: "Βαπτισμος, baptiſm; the act of dying, that is, of *plunging*." Edit. 1592.

57. SCHWARZIUS: "Βαπτιζω, to baptize. I. *To plunge*, to *overwhelm*, to *dip into* *. II. To waſh, by *plunging*, Luke xi. 38. Mark vii. 4. Sometimes to

* To authenticate this, as the native and primary meaning of the term, he produces the following authorities. "POLYB. III. C. 72. Μολις ἑως των μαζων οι πεζοι βαπτιζομενοι διεβαινον, vix tranſibant pedites ad mammas uſque *merſi*. IDEM, V.C. 47. Αυτοι ὑπ' αυτων βαπτιζομενοι και καταδυνοντες εν τοις τελμασιν, ipſi a ſe ipſis mergebantur et deprimebantur in paludibus. DIO, XXXVIII. p. 84. Παντελως βαπτιζονται, omnino *merguntur*. IDEM, XXXVII. extr. p. 64. Χειμων τοιουτος εξαιφνης την χωραν απασαν κατεσχεν, ωστε—τα πλοια τα εν τω Τιβεριδι—βαπτισθηναι, tanta tempeſtas ſubito per totam regionem extitit, ut navigia in Tiberi *mergerentur*. IDEM, L. p. 492. Πως μεν αν ουχ ὑπ' αυτου του πληθους των κωπων βαπτισθειη, quomodo non ipſa remorum multitudine, *ſubmergatur*? Adde p. 502, 505. PORPHYRIUS *de Styge*, p. 282. Οταν δε κατηγορουμενος επιβη, αναμαρτητος μεν ων αδεως διερχεται, αχρι των γονατων εχων το ὑδωρ αμαρτων δε, ολιγον προβας βαπτιζεται μεχρι κεφαλης. Quum autem accuſatus ingreditur lacum, ſecure, ſi peccati ſit expers, tranſit, merſus uſque ad genua. Sin peccarit, paulum progreſſus *ſubmergitur* uſque ad caput. DIODORUS SICULUS, I. p. 33. Των δε χερσαιων θηριων τα πολλα μεν ὑπο του ποταμου περιληφθεντα διαφθειρεται βαπτιζομενα, τινα δε εις τους μετεωρους εκφευγοντα τοπους διασωζεται. Animalium terreſtrium multa a flumine Nilo correpta *mergendo* perduntur: alia in editos locos fugientia ſervantur. Adde STRABON. VI. p. 421. JOSEPH. *Bell. Jud.* p. 259. init. Activum quoque in ſignificatione paſſiva eſt apud JOSEPH. *Antiq.* IX. C. x. § 2. Οσον ουπω μελλοντος βαπτιζειν του σκαφους, quum navis *mergeretur* tantum, quantum nondum cœperat."

to *ſprinkle*, to *beſprinkle*, to *pour upon* *. III. To purify and conſecrate to God, by *plunging*. Matt. iii. 6, 11, 13, 14. and elſewhere—Βαπτιςης, *the Baptiſt*, who ſuſtained the ſingular and ſacred office, of *plunging* men deſirous of ſalvation, that they might know themſelves to be devoted to God." *Comment. Crit. et Philolog. Ling. Græc.*

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It will be allowed, I think, by every competent and impartial judge, that many of the authors from whoſe writings theſe quotations are made, may be juſtly numbered among the *firſt literary characters* that any age has produced; and, therefore, as likely to know the true meaning of a Greek term, as any of our late oppoſers. And as all theſe conceſſions, declarations, and reaſonings, proceeded from perſons that either approved, or practiſed, pouring or ſprinkling, in the adminiſtration of the ordinance under conſideration; ſo there is the higheſt reaſon to conclude, that nothing but the *force* of evidence and a *conſcientious* regard to truth, could have induced them thus to ſpeak: for it is manifeſt, that ſuch aſſertions have, at leaſt, the *appearance* of ſupporting a contrary practice.—To the foregoing quota-

* His only authorities for the two *latter* of theſe ideas, are the following; "ÆSCHYLUS *Prometh. Vinct.* p. 53. Διϑηκτον εν σφαγαισι βαψασα ξιφος, ancipitem gladium cædibus *tingens*. Apud PLATON. *in Convivio*. p. 316. ARISTOPHANES de ſe dicit, και γαρ και αυτος ειμι των χϑες βαβαπτισμενων. Etenim ego quoque ſum ex iis qui heri multum biberunt." Whether theſe paſſages do not confirm the idea of *plunging* and *overwhelming*, rather than that of *ſprinkling*, or *pouring*, for which they were produced, let the learned judge.

quotations from Pædobaptiſts, whom candour itſelf muſt ſuppoſe inclined to make as few conceſſions to the Baptiſts, as the evidence of ſtubborn facts would admit; let us add the atteſtation of one that may be conſidered, as an *impartial ſpectator* of the controverſy about the right manner of adminiſtering baptiſm. The author to whom I advert, is the famous ROBERT BARCLAY. "Βαπτιζω, ſays he, ſignifies *immergo*; that is, to *plunge* and *dip in:* and that was the proper uſe of water baptiſm among the Jews, and alſo by John and the primitive Chriſtians who uſed it. Whereas our adverſaries, for the moſt part, only *ſprinkle a little water* upon the forehead, which doth not *at all* anſwer the word *baptiſm*—ſo that if our adverſaries will ſtick to the word, they muſt alter their method of ſprinkling *." Such is the teſtimony of his impartial pen.

REFLECT. II. By the numerous quotations here produced from learned Pædobaptiſts, we are plainly taught, That immerſion, plunging, or dipping, is the *radical, primary,* and *proper* meaning of the word *baptiſm.* See No *paſſim*—That it has no other ſignification in Mark vii. 4. which has been commonly pleaded in favour of a different ſenſe. See No 8. 31. 34. 57.—That the idea of immerſion is retained in the *metaphorical* baptiſm, not only of our Lord's paſſion, but alſo in that of the Spirit and of fire. See No 3. 35 †.—That the word *baptiſm*, is never uſed in Scripture for *ſprinkling*. See No 31.—That the preſent prevailing practice, in theſe parts of the world, ſhould be called *rhantiſm*, rather than *baptiſm.* See No 2. 40. and CHAP. IV. No. 56.—And, that the reaſon of a *new idea* being annexed to the

* *Apology*, p. 444. 448. Edit. 6th.

† Concerning baptiſm in the *cloud* and in the *ſea*, ſee CHAP. III. No. 7.

the term baptiſm, was the introduction of a *new cuſtom*, as to the mode of adminiſtration. See No 47.—Such is the purport of what the moſt learned Pædobaptiſts acknowledge and aſſert, concerning the word in diſpute; which, whether it be in favour of our practice, I leave the reader to judge.

REFLECT. III. Mr. ADDINGTON has juſtly obſerved, that "if there are two tranſlations of a word, one of which is *certainly* true, and the other *may be* falſe, it is eaſy to ſee which the wiſe and candid would prefer*." Now, on the authorities here produced—authorities of commentators, of critics, and of lexicographers, the moſt reſpectable—we may venture to aſſert, that the word baptiſm *certainly* ſignifies immerſion, whatever meaning it may have beſides; conſequently, both candour and prudence require us to embrace that acceptation, in preference to any other.—But ſuppoſing, without granting, that the word under conſideration is occaſionally uſed by inſpired writers, or by Greek claſſics, to ſignify *waſhing*, where there is no immerſion, or even to denote *ſprinkling*; yet while it is allowed by ſo many of the firſt characters for ſacred criticiſm, that its *primary* and *proper* meaning is immerſion; there is no reaſon to depart from it in the adminiſtration of a divine ordinance; except it can be proved, that the *deſign* of the inſtitution will not comport with it, or that the *practice* of the Apoſtles was a departure from it: concerning both which, we ſhall hear the verdict of learned men in ſubſequent Chapters.—The following are good obſervations, I think, relating to the true ſignification and uſe of words; and they come from the pens of Pædobaptiſts. "In words which are capable of two ſenſes, ſays Dr. JONATHAN EDWARDS, the *natural*

* *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſ.* p. 34.

natural and *proper* is the *primary*; and therefore ought, in the *firſt* place and *chiefly*, to be regarded*." Another very eminent writer, when endeavouring to fix the meaning of an important word, in oppoſition to a learned author, makes the following preliminary obſervation; "I ſhall premiſe that which I judge not an unreaſonable demand, ſays Dr. JOHN OWEN, namely, That if the ſignification of the word in any, or all the places which he mentions, ſhould ſeem doubtful unto any (as it doth not unto me) that the uncertainty of a *very few* places, ſhould not make us queſtion the proper ſignification of a word, whoſe ſenſe is determined in *ſo many*, wherein it is clear and unqueſtionable†." And the late Mr. JAMES HERVEY, when diſputing the ſignification of a Greek particle with Mr. J. WESLEY, ſays; "I am ready to grant, that places may be found where the prepoſition εν muſt be underſtood according to your ſenſe. But then every one knows, that this is not the *native*, *obvious*, *literal* meaning; rather a meaning *ſwayed*, *influenced*, *moulded*, by the preceding or following word——He will not allow the Greek prepoſition εν to ſignify *in*; though I can prove it to have been in peaceable poſſeſſion of this ſignification for more than two thouſand years‡."—Now if the numerous authors here produced, be not under a groſs miſtake in fixing the *natural* and *proper* meaning of the term baptiſm; and if EDWARDS, OWEN, and HERVEY, do not proceed on falſe principles in ſettling the ſenſe of words; then, though many inconteſtible inſtances could be brought, that βαπτιζω, in certain connections,

* *Preſervative againſt Socinianiſm*, Part. III. p. 52.

† *Doctrine of Juſtif.* Chap. IV. p. 218, Glaſgow Edit.

‡ *Letters to Mr.* J. WESLEY. Let. II. p. 26. Let. X. p. 232.

connections, ſignifies *to waſh*, without including the idea of dipping; and that, on ſome occaſions, it alſo ſignifies to *pour*, and to *ſprinkle*; yet immerſion would ſtill be the *grand*, *ruling* idea, and *plunging* the right mode of adminiſtration. Surely, then, we ought not haſtily, or for trivial reaſons, to deſert the original, the natural, and proper ſenſe of a term that was choſen by the unerring Spirit, when a new branch of holy worſhip was appointed; which term was intended to direct the church in all future ages, *how* that worſhip ſhould be performed.

It ſhould be well obſerved, that when our Lord after his reſurrection, ſays, *Go—baptize*; he does not mention baptiſm by way of alluſion, or incidentally. No, he ſpeaks the language of *legiſlation*: he delivers DIVINE LAW. He mentions and appoints baptiſm, as an ordinance of God, and as a branch of human duty. Where, then, muſt we expect preciſion in the uſe of terms, if not on ſuch an occaſion? Can it be ſuppoſed, without impeaching the wiſdom or the goodneſs of Chriſt, that he enacted a law relating to his own worſhip, the *principal* term in which is *obſcure* and *ambiguous*? Can it be imagined, that he *intended* an ambiguity ſo great in the term *baptiſm*, which preſcribes the duty to be performed, as to warrant either the uſe of *immerſion*, or of *pouring*, or of *ſprinkling*, which are three different actions? We may ſafely challenge our oppoſers to produce an inſtance of this kind out of the Moſaic ritual. Does Jehovah, when giving his poſitive laws, make uſe of a term that properly ſignifies *dipping*? He means as he ſpeaks, and requires immerſion, in contradiſtinction to pouring and ſprinkling. Does he, on the other hand, employ a word which, properly underſtood, ſignifies *pouring*? Or, does he chooſe an expreſſion, the radical idea of

which is no other than *ſprinkling?* He ſtill means as he ſpeaks, and injoins what he mentions, in diſtinction from every other action. That dipping, pouring, and ſprinkling, denote three different actions in the language of divine law, as well as in the eſtimate of common ſenſe, we have a remarkable example, in Lev. iv. 6, 7. *And the prieſt ſhall* DIP, βαψει, (SEPTUAG.) *his finger in the blood, and* SPRINKLE, προσραινει, *of the blood ſeven times before the Lord, before the veil of the ſanctuary. And the prieſt ſhall* —— POUR, εχχεει, *all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar.* Nay, were the leading term in any human law, to have an ambiguity in it, equal to that for which our Brethren plead with regard to the word *baptiſm*; ſuch law would certainly be conſidered as betraying, either the weakneſs, or the wickedneſs, of the legiſlator; and be condemned, as opening a door to perpetual chicane and painful uncertainty. Far be it, then, from us to ſuppoſe, that our gracious and omniſcient Lord ſhould give a law relating to divine worſhip, and obligatory on the moſt illiterate of his real diſciples, which may be fairly conſtrued to mean, *this*, or *that*, or the *other* action—a law, which is calculated to excite and perpetuate contention among his wiſeſt and ſincereſt followers—a law, that would diſgrace a Britiſh Parliament, in reſpect of its *triple* meaning, as being involved in the dark ambiguity of a Pagan oracle.—It muſt, therefore, be at our peril, if we indulge a wanton fancy in the interpretation of that law which is now before us. For, as Mr. CHARNOCK obſerves, "'Tis a part of God's ſovereignty to be the interpreter, as well as the maker, of his own laws; as it is a right inherent in the legiſlative power among men. So that it is an *invaſion of his right* to faſten a ſenſe upon his declared

clared will, which doth not *naturally flow* from the words. For to put any interpretation according to our pleaſure upon divine as well as human laws, contrary to their true intent, is a virtual uſurpation of this power; becauſe if laws may be interpreted according to our humours, the power of the law would be more in the interpreter than in the legiſlator *." Were the ſame licence of interpretation uſed in conſtruing the law of the ſacred ſupper, as numbers practiſe on the term baptiſm; we ſhould probably ſoon behold an obſolete and ſuperſtitious cuſtom revived; the cuſtom, I mean, of employing a *reed*, a glaſs, or a ſilver, *tube*, or ſomething ſimilar, by which to *ſuck* the wine out of the cup †. When our Lord inſtituted the holy ſupper, his order was, concerning the wine, Πιετε εξ αυτου παντες DRINK *ye all of it*, Matt. xxvi. 27. Now none will diſpute that πιετε, is from πινω; or, that the natural and proper ſignification of it is, *to drink*——in the full and moſt proper ſenſe, *to* DRINK. Nay, it will be allowed, I ſuppoſe, that if πινω does not ſignify that preciſe idea, there is never a word in the Greek Teſtament that *can* expreſs it. Yet the learned lexicographer SCHWARZIUS tells us, that it ſignifies not only to *drink*; but alſo to SUCK, to *imbibe*, to *admit*, to *receive*; for which he refers to Heb. vi. 7. A clear proof, defenders of the foremention'd obſolete practice might ſay, that it is lawful to receive the wine at the Lord's table, by *ſuction*.—Our Brethren ought not to forget, that the principal terms of *a law*, and eſpecially of a law relating to divine worſhip, ſhould be underſtood in their *natural, obvious, primary* ſenſe; and that it is a dangerous

* *Of Man's Enmity to God*, p. 98.

† HOSPINIANI *Hiſt. Sac.* L. IV. C. II. p. 248. VENEM. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. VI. p. 193.

dangerous thing to depart from it, except ſome glaring abſurdity would follow by adhering to it. This remark is perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of Sir WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, who lays it down as a rule of legal interpretation; That the words of a law "are generally to be underſtood in their *uſual* and *moſt known* ſignification; not ſo much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their *general* and *popular uſe*:"—but, "where words bear either *none*, or a *very abſurd* ſignification, if literally underſtood, we muſt a little deviate from the received ſenſe of them*." This, we may venture to ſay, is a rule of good ſenſe, as well as of legal knowledge; and ſhould be conſtantly regarded in our interpretation of laws, whether divine, or human. Whereas, if we wantonly depart from it, almoſt any hypotheſis may be ſupported; for there is no word, in any language, that may not, by an alluſive or metaphorical way of uſing it, be rendered liable to have the whole of its natural and primary ſenſe expounded away, by taking ſuch a liberty.

REFLECT. IV. While our brethren maintain, that the term *baptiſm*, when relating to the inſtitution ſo called, means any thing ſhort of *immerſion*; it behoves them to inform us, which of our Engliſh words is competent to expreſs its adequate idea. Is it *waſhing?* If ſo, we may conſider that word as a proper tranſlation of it†, and a complete ſubſtitute for it, wherever the ordinance before us is mentioned

* *Commentaries*, Vol. I. p. 59, 60. Dublin Edit.

† *Baptiſm*, is the Greek word, with an Engliſh termination; concerning which Mr. LEWIS ſays, "Our laſt tranſlators were directed by the King to retain the old eccleſiaſtical words," of which baptiſm was one. *Hiſt. of Eng. Tranſlations*, p. 317. 326. Edit. 2d.

mentioned by the ſacred writers. Let us make the experiment on a few paſſages. We will take, for inſtance, the words of Ananias to Saul, Acts xxii. 16. which muſt be read thus; *Ariſe and be* WASHED, *and* WASH *away thy ſins:* and thoſe of Paul, Rom. vi. 3. and Gal. iii. 27. *Know ye not that ſo many of us as were* WASHED *into Jeſus Chriſt, were* WASHED *into his death? As many of us as have been* WASHED *into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.*—Is it *pouring?* Then we muſt read Mark i. 9. and Acts ii. 38, 41. thus; *Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was* POURED *of John in* (εις, *into*) *Jordan. Repent and be* POURED *every one of you—Then they that gladly received his word, were* POURED.—Is it *ſprinkling?* Then we muſt read, John iii. 23. Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. thus; *John alſo was* SPRINKLING *in Enon near to Salim,* BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER *there: and they came and were* SPRINKLED. *Therefore we are* BURIED *with him by* SPRINKLING *into death.* BURIED *with him by* SPRINKLING." Theſe few examples may ſuffice to ſhew, what an awkward appearance the noble ſenſe and maſculine diction of inſpiration wear, when expreſſed according to this hypotheſis. Whereas, if, inſtead of *waſhing, pouring*, or *ſprinkling*, you employ the word *immerſion*; the preceding paſſages will make a very different figure, and read thus; *Ariſe and be* IMMERSED, *and waſh away thy ſins. Know ye not that ſo many of us as were* IMMERSED *into Jeſus Chriſt, were* IMMERSED *into his death? As many of us as have been* IMMERSED *into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt. Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was* IMMERSED *of John in* (or *into*) *Jordan. Repent and be* IMMERSED *every one of you—Then they that gladly received his word, were* IMMERSED. *John alſo was*

IMMERSING

IMMERSING *in Enon near to Salim, becauſe there was* MUCH WATER *there: and they came and were* IMMERSED. *Therefore we are buried with him by* IMMERSION *into death. Buried with him by* IMMERSION. Here we have, if I miſtake not, both dignity of ſentiment and propriety of language.

Let us now apply the ſame various terms to the different *metaphorical* baptiſms of which we read in the New Teſtament. There we have, the baptiſm of *ſufferings*, of the *Spirit* and of *fire*, of the *cloud* and the *ſea*. According to our Brethren, the paſſages to which I refer muſt be read, either thus: *I have* A WASHING *to be* WASHED WITH, *and how am I ſtraitned till it be accompliſhed! He ſhall* WASH *you with* (rather, *in*; ") *the Holy Spirit and in fire. And were all* WASHED *unto Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea.* Luke xii. 50. Matt. iii. 11. 1 Cor. x. 2. Or thus; *I have a* POURING *to be* POURED *with, and how am I ſtraitned till it be accompliſhed! He ſhall* POUR *you in the Holy Spirit and in fire. And were all* POURED *unto Moſes, in the cloud and in the ſea.*—Or thus; *I have a* SPRINKLING *to be* SPRINKLED *with, and how am I ſtraitned till it be accompliſhed! He ſhall* SPRINKLE *you in the Holy Spirit and in fire. And were all* SPRINKLED *unto Moſes, in the cloud and in the ſea.*—According to us, the manner of reading theſe paſſages will be this; *I have an* IMMERSION *to be* IMMERSED *with, and how am I ſtraitned till it be accompliſhed! He ſhall* IMMERSE *you in the Holy Spirit and in fire. And were all* IMMERSED *unto Moſes, in the cloud and in the ſea.* In regard to Luke xii. 50. if you render the word *baptiſm* by the term *waſhing*, you not only ſink the vigorous idea, but convey a ſentiment foreign to the text. For the word *waſhing* plainly ſuggeſts the notion of cleanſing; whereas it is manifeſt, that our Lord here ſpeaks of

himſelf

himſelf perſonally—of himſelf, not as to be *cleanſed from* ſin, but *puniſhed for* it; or as the Apoſtle aſſerts, MADE A CURSE FOR US. To adopt the word *pouring*, would exceedingly dilute and impoveriſh the marvellous meaning, if not render the paſſage quite ambiguous. And, to uſe the term *ſprinkling*, common ſenſe turns abhorrent; as it would render the emphatical and admirable text quite ridiculous. For who can ſeriouſly imagine, that our Lord intended to repreſent his *moſt bitter* ſufferings, by the *ſprinkling* of a few drops of water on a perſon? If it be poſſible for any word when uſed metaphorically, to expreſs the idea of *immerſion*, *plunging*, *overwhelming*; we have it here, in the term *baptiſm:* and, in reſpect of the two other paſſages, whether our ſenſe of the word in queſtion, or that of our Brethren, be more emphatical, and the language more agreeable, the Reader will determine.

Further: If it be lawful to adminiſter the ordinance before us, by pouring or ſprinkling, equally as by immerſion; it muſt be, becauſe that diverſity of adminiſtration is warranted, either by the command of our divine Law-giver, or by the practice of his Apoſtles. But if ſo, is it not very ſurpriſing, that the ſacred Penmen of the New Teſtament, when recording precepts and facts for our direction in this affair, have never uſed a term, the *natural* and *proper* meaning of which, is pouring, or ſprinkling? This is the more ſurpriſing as, in other caſes, apparently of much leſs conſequence to the purity of divine worſhip, they frequently employ ſuch words as are adapted to expreſs thoſe ideas without any ambiguity. If *pouring*, for inſtance, be a legitimate way of performing the rite, what can be the reaſon that εκχεω, προσχεω, or προσχυσις, is never uſed in all the New Teſtament, concerning the adminiſtration of baptiſm?

baptiſm? Or, if *ſprinkling* be a proper mode of proceeding, how comes it that ῥαντιζω, ῥαντισμος, or ſome other term of the ſame ſignification, does not appear in any command or precedent, relating to the ſubject of controverſy? Why ſhould thoſe Greek words juſt mentioned, and all others of a ſimilar meaning, (whether uſed by Pagan claſſics, or the Septuagint tranſlators) be excluded from precepts and examples of the inſtitution before us; while βαπτιζω, βαπτισμα, and βαπτισμος, are appropriated to that ſervice, if pouring, or ſprinkling, had been at all intended by our Lord, or ever practiſed by his Apoſtles? See No. 33. On our principles, the reaſon is plain: The great Legiſlator deſigned that his followers ſhould be IMMERSED, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:* in purſuance, therefore, of this deſign, ſuch words are uſed concerning the ordinance, as *naturally* and *properly* ſignify that idea. But, though our Brethren maintain the lawfulneſs of *pouring*, and *ſprinkling*, they cannot produce one inſtance from the divine rubric of this inſtitution, of any word being uſed which *naturally* and *properly* expreſſes either of thoſe actions.—It is very remarkable, that while few, or none, of our learned opponents dare deny that the term baptiſm conveys the idea of *immerſion*; and while none of them, ſo far as I have obſerved, venture to aſſert, that it *never* means any thing beſides pouring, or ſprinkling; yet, in their *practice*, pouring, or ſprinkling, is *conſtantly* uſed. Thus what is allowed by learned men in general, to be the *radical* idea of a capital term in divine law, is intirely kept out of ſight; while a preſumed *ſecondary* ſenſe, is the only thing that appears in their mode of proceeding.—Mr. ADDINGTON, indeed, ſays; "We

have

have not met with *one* text, in the whole Bible, that requires the immerſion of the whole body *." That long liſt of learned authors, however, with which the Reader is here preſented, ſeems to have been of a different opinion : and if the native ſignification of the term baptiſm, be immerſion; the action ſo called muſt be *required*, wherever divine law injoins the adminiſtration of baptiſm. This muſt be the caſe, except it can be proved, that the leading terms of a law ſhould be underſtood in a real, or ſuppoſed, *ſecondary* ſenſe. Has, then, Mr. ADDINGTON met with any text which requires *pouring*, or *ſprinkling*, in oppoſition to immerſion? Has he found any paſſage of ſacred writ, that *injoins* pouring, or ſprinkling, water on the *face*, in contradiſtinction to plunging the whole body? He will not, I think, dare to aſſert either the one or the other. But, if immerſion be not *required*, in contradiſtinction to pouring and ſprinkling; and if pouring, or ſprinkling, be not *required*, in oppoſition to immerſion; we ſhould conſider it as a favour, if this opponent would inform us, what *is* required. For the queſtion relates to the *mind of* CHRIST: it regards the meaning of a *divine* LAW: nor can we forbear thinking, that *ſomething* is required, *really*, and in *earneſt* required, which is called *baptiſm*; or elſe our Proteſtant principles would reclame againſt us, for performing any thing under that name as a branch of holy worſhip. While, therefore, any of our oppoſers deny that *immerſion* is required, they are obliged to prove, either, that their *own* mode of proceeding has the ſanction of a *divine requiſition*, excluſively of *ours*; or, that the Moſt High has, for once, conſulted the honour of the human will, by leaving the manner of performing a poſitive rite of religion

* *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſons*, p. 176.

religion intirely at the *option* of his worſhippers. The *former*, will be an arduous taſk; the *latter* is pregnant with impious abſurdity.

REFLECT. V. While the Pædobaptiſts maintain, that our great Law-giver intended any thing leſs than *dipping* the ſubject of the ordinance, whether it be waſhing, pouring, or ſprinkling; it is neceſſary for them to conſider, whether his deſign was, that water ſhould be applied, in any of theſe ways, to the *whole body*, or to ſome *particular part*. If the *former*, why do they not comply with his requiſition? Why make ſuch a partial application of the element? If the *latter*, what part muſt it be? Some pour water on the *back part* of the head, and call it baptiſm*. Others have *waſhed the face*, pronounced the preſcribed form of words, and thought the inſtitution was rightly adminiſtered †. What if others were to waſh the *hands* of a candidate, call it baptiſm, and plead, that waſhing the hands was a religious rite appointed by Jehovah, Deut. xxi. 6? Nay, what if ſome ſhould waſh the *feet*, pronounce it baptiſm, and appeal to Joh. xiii. 10. in juſtification of their conduct ‡? I leave the Reader to conſider, whether a miniſter has not as good a warrant, from the New Teſtament, thus to proceed, as he has to pour water upon, or to ſprinkle, the *face*; and then to

* Bp. BURNET's *Second Letter of his Travels*, p. 85. Edit. Amſterdam.

† Mr. NEALE's *Hiſt. Purit.* Vol. I. p. 543, 544. Octav. Edit.

‡ The *pedilavium*, practiſed in early times, was actually conſidered by ſome, in the beginning of the fourth Century, as a proper ſubſtitute for baptiſm; on which account, waſhing of the feet, by the biſhop, was forbidden by the Council of Eliberis. See Dr. GILL, on Joh. xiii. 15.

to conclude, that the party is duly and truly baptized.—It has been the opinion of ſome, that a child is baptized, on whatever part of his body the water may fall *: and we may juſtly demand, By what *law* of Chriſt, or by what *example* of the Apoſtles, is any one authorized to apply water to the *face*, or the *head*; rather than to the *hands*, or the *feet*, or any other part of the body? It ſhould never be forgotten, that the inſtitution about which we treat, is of a *poſitive* kind; and that we are not at liberty to perform it as we pleaſe, but are bound to obſerve the law of adminiſtration, enacted by our divine Sovereign. See CHAP. I.

In oppoſition to this partial application of water, it may be further obſerved; That when Jehovah appointed circumciſion, as it was to be performed on a particular part of the body, he *expreſsly mentioned* that part. When, alſo, he commanded a topical application of the ſacrificial blood and the anointing oil, he did not fail to *deſcribe* the parts intended, Lev. xiv. 14, 17: and ſuch was the obligation of his directions in reference to theſe affairs, that if Abraham had circumciſed a *finger*, inſtead of the *foreſkin*; or, had the blood and the oil been applied to any other parts of the body, than thoſe that were ſpecified; guilt would have been contracted, and the anger of the Lord incurred. So, on the other hand, when God injoined the prieſts or the people to *bathe*, had they only ſprinkled the *face*, poured water on the *hands*, or waſhed the *feet*, they would have been equally culpable. Now, baptiſm being a poſitive inſtitution, as well as thoſe ancient rites; what reaſon can be aſſigned, if water ſhould be applied only to a particular part of the body, why that part was not mentioned,

* VENEM. *Hiſt. Eccles.* Tom. VI. p. 192.

tioned, either in the inſtitution of the ordinance, or in ſome apoſtolic example of its adminiſtration? yet I do not remember to have obſerved, that any of our opponents pretend that it is.—In a word, if the preceding authorities from Pædobaptiſts themſelves, and, by ſome of thoſe learned authors, from the Greek claſſics *, do not ſufficiently warrant our ſenſe of the word under conſideration; we may juſtly challenge our Brethren to fix and authenticate the meaning of any term, in the original Scriptures, againſt any opponent whatever. To which I may add, if the term *baptiſm* do not determinately ſignify, that the ordinance ſhould be adminiſtered by *immerſing*, *plunging*, or *overwhelming* the ſubject in water; we ſhould be glad of information, what other expreſſion there is in the Greek Teſtament, which *could* have conveyed that idea, without being liable to ſimilar exceptions with thoſe againſt which we now contend. It may, therefore, be ſafely concluded, that if there be nothing in the *deſign* of the ordinance, nor in the apoſtolic *practice*, inconſiſtent with the notion of dipping; we do not deſerve reproach for inſiſting upon it, that *baptiſm* and *immerſion* are terms equivalent.

* To the claſſical authorities produced by DEVLINGIUS and SCHWARZIUS, No. 36, 57. a multitude of others might be added; as the reader may ſee, by conſulting Dr. GALE's *Reflections* on Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. of Inf. Bap.* Let. III.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The DESIGN *of Baptiſm; Or the Facts and Bleſſings repreſented by it, both in regard to our Lord and his Diſciples.*

WITSIUS: "Our Lord would be baptized, that he might conciliate authority to the baptiſm of John; that he might ſhew, that he is equally the head of thoſe who are baptized, as of thoſe who are circumciſed; and that he has communion with both, and came that of both he might make one: that by his own example, he might commend and ſanctify our baptiſm, equally as other ſacraments to which he ſubmitted; that men might not be loth to come to the baptiſm of the LORD, ſeeing the Lord was not backward to come to the baptiſm of a *ſervant:* that, by his baptiſm, he might repreſent the future condition both of himſelf and his followers; firſt *humble*, then *glorious*; now mean and low, then glorious and exalted; *that* repreſented by *immerſion*, *this* by *emerſion:* that by the uſe of this ſacrament, the promiſes of the covenant which was between himſelf and the Father, might be confirmed to him, concerning the intire expiation of thoſe offences which he took on himſelf, the juſtification and ſanctification of thoſe perſons whom he repreſented, and concerning a glorious reſurrection, by which he ſhould ſoon emerge out of the waters of tribulation, Pſalm cx. 7. and, finally, to declare, by his voluntary ſubmiſſion to baptiſm, that he would not delay the delivering up of himſelf to be immerſed in the torrents of hell, yet with a certain faith and hope of emerging——Immerſion into the water is to be

be conſidered by us, as exhibiting that dreadful abyſs of divine juſtice, in which Chriſt for our ſins, which he took on himſelf, was for a time as it were abſorbed; as in David, his type, he complains, Pſalm lxix. 3. More particularly, ſeeing ſuch an immerſion deprives a perſon of light, and of other things pertaining to this world, it excellently repreſents the *death* of Chriſt, while his continuance under water, however ſhort, denotes the *burial* of Chriſt, and the loweſt degree of his humiliation: when, being laid in a ſepulchre that was ſealed and guarded by the Roman ſoldiers, he was conſidered as entirely cut off. Emerſion out of the water, exhibits an image of his *reſurrection*, or of the victory which, being dead, he obtained over death, in his own dark domains, that is, the grave. All theſe things the Apoſtle intimates, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Beſides, baptiſm alſo repreſents thoſe *benefits*, both preſent and future, which believers obtain in Chriſt. Among the *preſent* benefits, the principal is, communion with the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, and, which is conſequent upon it, the mortification and burial of our old, and reſurrection of the new man, in virtue of the blood and Spirit of Chriſt. For, immerſion into the water, repreſents the death of the old man, in ſuch a manner as ſhews that he can neither ſtand in judgment to our condemnation, nor exerciſe dominion in our bodies, that we ſhould obey his luſts. In reſpect of the *former*, the death of the old man pertains to our juſtification; in regard to the *latter*, it belongs to our ſanctification. The continuance under the water, repreſents the burial of the body of ſin, by which all hope of its revival is cut off; ſo that it ſhall never be able afterwards, either to

to condemn the elect, or to reign over them." *Miſcel. Sac.* Tom. II. Exercit. XV. § 63. *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 25—29.

2. BUCANUS: Our Lord was baptized of John, "to ſignify that he was ſent that he might be *baptized*; that is, *immerſed in death*, and that he might waſh away our ſins with his own blood, Luke xii. 50." *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Loc. XLVII. Quæſt. XXXVII. p. 631.

3. A. H. FRANKIUS: "The baptiſm of Chriſt repreſented *his ſufferings*, Matt. xx. 22. and his coming up *out of the water*, his *reſurrection* from the dead." *Programmata*, Program. XIV. p. 343, 344.

4. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "In our baptiſm, we are *dipped* under the water, as ſignifying our covenant profeſſion, that as he was buried for ſin, we are *dead and buried to ſin*——They [your luſts] are *dead and buried* with him, for ſo your baptiſm ſignifieth; in which you are *put under the water*, to ſignify and profeſs, that your old man is dead and buried—— We are raiſed to holineſs by his Spirit, as we *riſe out of the water* in baptiſm." *Paraphraſe on the New Teſt.* at Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

5. M. SAURIN: "Paul ſays, *We are buried with him by baptiſm into death*; that is, the ceremony of *wholly immerſing* us in water, when we were baptized, ſignified, that we died to ſin; and that of raiſing us again from our immerſion ſignified, that we would no more return to thoſe diſorderly practices, in which we lived before our converſion to Chriſtianity." *Sermons*, Vol. III. p. 171. Mr. ROBINSON'S *Tranſlat.*

6. Dr. T. GOODWIN: "The eminent thing ſignified and repreſented in baptiſm, is, not ſimply the blood of Chriſt, as it *waſheth* us from ſin; but there is

is a further repreſentation therein of Chriſt's *death, burial,* and *reſurrection,* in the baptized's being firſt *buried under water,* and then *riſing out of it*; and this is not in a bare conformity unto Chriſt, but in a repreſentation of a *communion with Chriſt,* in that his death and reſurrection. Therefore it is ſaid, *We are* BURIED *with him in baptiſm*; and, *Wherein you are* RISEN *with him.* It is not ſimply ſaid, *like as* he was buried and roſe; but *with him.* So as our communion and oneneſs with him in his reſurrection, is repreſented to us therein, and not only our conformity or likeneſs unto him therein. And ſo baptiſm repreſenteth this to us, that Chriſt having once in himſelf ſuſtained the perſons of all the elect, in his burial and reſurrection; that, now upon the party himſelf who is baptized, is perſonally, particularly, and apparently *reacted* the ſame part again in his baptiſm; thereby ſhewing what his communion with Chriſt before was, in what was then done to Chriſt; that he then was buried with Chriſt, and roſe with him; and upon that ground is now, in this outward ſign of baptiſm, (as in a ſhew, or repreſentation) both buried and alſo riſeth again." *Chriſt ſet forth,* Sect. III. Chap. VII. p. 82, 83.

7. TURRETTINUS: "The paſſage of the Iſraelites through the Red ſea, wonderfully agrees with our baptiſm, and repreſents the grace it was deſigned to expreſs. For as, in baptiſm, when performed in the primitive manner, by *immerſion* and *emerſion,* deſcending *into the water,* and again *going out of it,* of which deſcent and aſcent we have an example in the Eunuch, Acts viii. 38, 39: yea, and what is more, as by this rite, when perſons are immerſed in water, they are overwhelmed, and as it were *buried,* and in a manner buried *together with Chriſt;*

Chriſt; and again, when they emerge, ſeem to be raiſed out of the grave, and are ſaid to riſe again with Chriſt, Rom. vi. 4, 5. Col. ii. 12: ſo, in the Moſaic baptiſm, we have an *immerſion*, and an *emerſion*; *that*, when they deſcended into the depths of the ſea; *this*, when they went out and came to the oppoſite ſhore. The *former*, was an image of death; the *latter*, of a reſurrection. For, paſſing through the bottom of the ſea, were they not near to death? And eſcaping to the oppoſite ſhore, were they not as if revived from the dead?——As in *former* times, the perſons to be baptized were *immerſed* in the water, *continued under* the water, and *emerged out* of it, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38; ſo the old man *died* in them and was *buried*, and the new man *aroſe*, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. As *now*, perſons to be baptized, are *ſprinkled* with water; ſo they are *ſprinkled* with the blood and Spirit of Chriſt, to the waſhing away of ſin, Acts xxii. 16. Epheſ. v. 26, 27. Heb. ix. 14." *Diſputat. de Bap. Nubis et Maris*, § 24. *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Tom. III. Loc. XIX. Quæſt. XI. § 14.

8. Bp. PATRICK: "Though we, by going into the water, profeſs that we are willing to take up the croſs, and die for Chriſt's ſake; yet, on God's part, this action of going into and coming out of the water again, did ſignify, that he would bring ſuch perſons to live again—The miniſter's putting them in, and taking them out of the water, is a ſign of their deſcending into the ſtate of the dead, and their aſcending up from thence——It is further manifeſt from all the circumſtances of baptiſm. For they put off their old cloaths, and ſtript themſelves of their garments; then they were immerſed all over, and buried in the water; which notably ſignified the *putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh*." *Aqua*

Genitalis, p. 436, 437. 421. in Dr. RUSSEL'S *Juſt Vindicat. of Doct. and Pract. of John*, &c. p. 140, 141.

9. PICTETUS: "That *immerſion* into, and *emerſion* out of the water, practiſed by the ancients, ſignify the *death* of the old, and the *reſurrection* of the new man, Rom. vi. Col. ii." *Theolog. Chriſt.* L. XIV. C. IV. § 13.

10. Bp. DAVENANT: "In baptiſm, the *burial* of the body of ſin, or of the old Adam, is repreſented, when the perſon to be baptized is put down into the water; as a *reſurrection*, when he is brought out of it." *Expoſ. Epiſt. ad Coloſſ.* in Cap. II. 12.

11. Dr. BOYS: "The *dipping* in holy baptiſm has three parts; the *putting into* the water, the *continuance* in the water, and the *coming out* of the water. The putting into the water, doth ratify the mortification of ſin by the power of Chriſt's death, as Paul, Rom. vi. 3. *Know ye not that all we which have been baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, have been baptized into his death, and that our old man is crucified with him?* The continuance in the water, notes the *burial of ſin*; to wit, a continual increaſe of mortification by the power of Chriſt's death and burial, Rom. vi. 4. The coming out of the water, figured our *ſpiritual reſurrection* and vivification to newneſs of life, by the power of Chriſt's reſurrection, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12." *Works*, p. 294. Edit. 1629.

12. MASTRICHT: "As in the baptiſmal waſhing, eſpecially when performed by *immerſion*, we are plunged in the water, abide in it a little while, and then emerge; ſo Chriſt was, for us, immerſed in death, continued under its dominion the ſpace of three days, and then emerged by his reſurrection.

——As,

——As, in the baptiſmal waſhing, eſpecially when performed by *immerſion*, we are planted in water, ſo we are planted both in the blood and body of Chriſt, when we are baptized into his myſtical body, 1 Cor. xii. 13: and as we, in a manner, put on water, ſo alſo do we put on Chriſt, Gal. iii. 27. Again; As Chriſt, by that baptiſm of his own blood, Matt. xx. 22. died, was buried, and roſe again; ſo we are planted in him, ſpiritually *die* with him to ſin, are *buried* and *riſe again*, Rom. vi. 3—6. Col. ii. 11, 12, 13. Further; As by water the body is cleanſed, 1 Pet. iii. 21; ſo by the blood and Spirit of Chriſt, the ſoul is purified, 1 John i. 7. Finally; As in baptiſm we *emerge* out of a ſepulchre of water, and paſs, as it were, into a new life; ſo alſo being delivered from every kind of death, we ſhall be ſaved to eternal life, Mark xvi. 16." *Theoret. Pract. Theolog.* L. VII. C. IV. § 10.

13. GROTIUS: "*Buried with him by baptiſm.* Not only the word *baptiſm*, but the very *form* of it, intimates this. For, an *immerſion of the whole body* in water, ſo that it is no longer beheld, bears an image of that burial which is given to the dead. So Col. ii. 12.—There was in baptiſm, as adminiſtered in former times, an image both of a *burial* and of a *reſurrection*; which, in reſpect of Chriſt, was external; in regard to Chriſtians, internal, Rom. vi. 4." *In* Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.

14. Mr. BURKIT: "*We are buried with him by baptiſm into death.* The Apoſtle alludes, no doubt, to the *ancient manner and way* of baptizing perſons in thoſe hot countries, which was by *immerſion*, or putting them under water for a time, and then raiſing them up again out of the water; which rite had alſo a myſtical ſignification, repreſenting the *burial*

of

of our old man, ſin in us, and our *reſurrection* to newneſs of life." *Expoſ. Notes*, on Rom. vi. 4.

15. VITRINGA: "To be *immerſed* in water, and to be *under* water, repreſent the *death* and *burial* of our old man, in virtue of the death of Chriſt. To be waſhed with water, denotes our being *juſtified* and *ſanctified*. To *emerge* out of the water, ſignifies our being ſaved *from death*, in virtue of Chriſt's death; our being regenerated to a lively hope; and our being raiſed again to a new life, that ſhall never ceaſe." *Aphoriſmi Sanct. Theolog.* Aphor. 891.

16. CONFESSION OF SUEVELAND: "As touching baptiſm we confeſs, that which the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof, That we by it are *buried* into the death of Chriſt, made one body, and do put on Chriſt." Chapter XVII. in *Harmony of Confeſſ.* p. 410. Cambridge, 1586.

17. BUCANUS: "*Immerſion* into the water, or aſperſion, plainly denotes, the ſprinkling of the blood of Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins and the imputation of righteouſneſs: and the continuance *under water*, however ſhort, the *death* and *burial* of our native corruption (in virtue of our Lord's death and burial) that is, the mortification of the old Adam, which is the firſt part of our regeneration; but *emerſion*, the *riſing* of the new man, or quickening and newneſs of life; and ſo, analogically, our *future reſurrection* is, as it were, preſented to view. Rom. vi. 3, 4. and iv. 5, 13." *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Loc. XLVII. Quæſt. xxxiv. p. 621.

18. ZANCHIUS: "Being dead to ſin, we are buried, and, as it were, *plunged* with Chriſt, by baptiſm; as in Rom. vi. 3, 4." *In Epiſt. ad Epheſ. Opera*, Tom. VII. p. 217.

19 LIM-

19. LIMBORCH: "Baptiſm is a figure and mark of our ſpiritual burial. For by that *immerſion* into water, and *continuance* under the water, which repreſent *a burial*; baptized perſons expreſs their being buried to ſin." *Comment. in Epiſt. ad Rom.* ad Cap. vi. 4.

20. CASTALIO: "*Elſe what ſhall they do who are baptized for the dead?*——That you may underſtand this place of Paul, conſider the manner and nature of baptiſm, as deſcribed, Rom. vi. in theſe words: *As many of us as have been baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death.* And a little after, *For if we have been planted together in the likeneſs of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſs of his reſurrection.* This, therefore, is the argument of Paul; When Chriſtians are baptized, they are baptized for this purpoſe, that they may *die* with Chriſt, and then *riſe again.*" *In* 1 Cor. xv. 29.

21. SCHOETTGENIUS: "The Apoſtle forms a compariſon between baptiſm and death. He that is baptized, is *intirely under water*, and no longer ſeems to live. When, therefore, we Chriſtians are baptized, it is into the death of Chriſt; that is, that we ſhould become imitators of his death. Baptiſm obligeth us to become like our Lord in his death and reſurrection." *Horæ Hebraicæ*, ad Rom. vi. 4. p. 515.

22. HOORNBEEKIUS: "The Apoſtle ſpeaking of what was notorious and certain, ſays; *Know ye not, that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death?* Rom. vi. 3. refering to what is performed in baptiſm; namely, the *entrance into the water*, and *the going out of it.* For he immediately adds; *Therefore, we are buried with him, by baptiſm.* And, Col. ii. 12. *Buried with*

with him in baptiſm, wherein alſo ye are riſen with him. As, in reſpect of Chriſt, his death was followed by his reſurrection from the dead; ſo our conformity to him conſiſts in dying and riſing again with him. This is clearly preſented to our view and ſealed, by that *immerſion* and *emerſion* which are in baptiſm." *Theolog. Pract.* L. IX. C. XXII. Tom. II. p. 388.

23. TILENUS: "The *ceremony* in baptiſm is three-fold: *immerſion* into the water, a *continuance* under the water, and a *riſing out* of the water—The *internal* and *eſſential* form of baptiſm is no other than that analogical proportion of the ſigns, already explained, with the things ſignified. For as it is a property of water to waſh away the filth of the body; ſo it repreſents the power of Chriſt's blood in the cleanſing from ſin. Thus *immerſion* into the water declares, by the moſt agreeable analogy, the mortification of the old man; and *emerſion* out of the water, the vivification of the new man—The ſame *plunging* into the water exhibits to our view, that dreadful abyſs of divine juſtice, in which Chriſt, on account of our ſins, was for a time in a manner ſwallowed up. *Abiding under the water*, however ſhort the time, denotes his deſcent to hell; that is, as we have elſewhere declared, the loweſt degree of abaſement, when, in a ſealed and guarded ſepulchre, he was conſidered as one intirely cut off. *Emerſion out of the water*, preſents us with an image of that victory which he, though dead, obtained over death, even in his own pavilion; that is, the ſepulchre. Thus, therefore, it is right that we who are *baptized into his death*, and buried with him, ſhould alſo riſe again with him, and walk in newneſs of life. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." *Syntag. Diſputat.* Pars II. Diſp. XLI. § 15. 32. 34.

24. STAF-

24. STAPFERUS: "The Apoſtle explains the ſacrament of baptiſm, by communion with the *death* and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. III. § 1638.

25. BURMANNUS: "The external rite, in baptiſm, having the image, as well of *overwhelming* and *ſuffocation*, as of *waſhing*, bears alſo a twofold figure: and ſignifies, partly, the *death* and *burial* of Chriſt, and our communion with them;—partly, the waſhing away of ſin, by the blood and Spirit of Chriſt; or the juſtification and ſanctification of a ſinner. Rom. vi. 4. 1 Pet. iii. xx. Acts ii. 38. Tit. iii. 5." *Synopſ. Theolog.* Tom. II. Loc. XLIII. C. VIII. § 3.

26. ROELL: "The ſignification of baptiſm is taught, Rom. vi. namely, that it is a ſign and ſeal of the *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, and of our communion with them. For he that is *immerſed* in water, which has the power of ſuffocating, is conſidered as in a ſtate of *death*; and likewiſe, as long as he continues immerſed, he is there *buried*. But, when he *riſes* out of the water, he ariſes, as it were, from a ſtate of death, and begins to live afreſh. Of what kind this newneſs of life is, baptiſm alſo, at the ſame time, diſtinctly repreſents. For, as water has the power of *waſhing* and *purifying*, it ſignifies, that, in virtue of our Lord's death, the perſon baptized is cleanſed from ſin, and that he ought to live a new and a pure life, without the pollution of ſin. ——When perſons are baptized in faith, they are *buried with Chriſt*; to ſignify, that they are no longer under the curſe. They riſe with Chriſt, or rather they are raiſed; as they that are baptized, after *immerſion* into water, *riſe again* out of the water, when

when they repent and ſo riſe again from a death in ſin. And thus alſo they riſe again to a new life and are quickned: they live with Chriſt here in grace, and ſhall for ever live in glory." *Explicat. Epiſt. ad Ephes.* in Cap. IV. 5. *Exegeſis. Epiſt. ad Coloſs.* in Cap. II. 13.

27. LAMPE: "Water, in the ſacrament of baptiſm, repreſents the *paſſive obedience* and *death* of Chriſt, and the communion of believers with them." *Prolegom. in* JOAN. L. I. C. II. § 23.

28. ABP. LEIGHTON: "That baptiſm doth apply and ſeal to the believer his intereſt in the death and reſurrection of Chriſt, the Apoſtle St. Paul teaches to the full, Rom. vi. 4. *We are buried with him by baptiſm into death; that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life.* Where the *dipping* into the water is referred to, as repreſenting our dying with Chriſt; and the *return thence*, as expreſſive of our riſing with him." *Comment.* upon 1 Pet. iii. 21.

29. BRAUNIUS: "By baptiſm we are *plunged under the water*, and, as it were, *buried*; but we do not continue in a ſtate of death, for we immediately riſe again from thence: to ſignify, that we, through the merits of Chriſt, and with Chriſt, *mortify* the old man, are *buried* with Chriſt, and with him *ariſe* to newneſs of life. *We are buried with him, by baptiſm into death; that, like as Chriſt was raiſed from the dead, to the glory of the Father, ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life*, Rom. vi. 4, 5." *Doc. Foed.* Pars IV. Cap. xxi. § 11.

30. Dr. MANTON: "*We are buried with him in baptiſm into his death:* the like expreſſion you have, Col. ii. 12. *Buried with him in baptiſm, wherein alſo ye*

ye are riſen with him. The putting the baptized perſon *into the water*, denoteth and proclaimeth the *burial* of Chriſt, and we by ſubmitting to it are baptized [*buried*] with him, or profeſs to be dead to ſin; for none but the *dead* are buried. So that it ſignifieth Chriſt's death for ſin, and our dying unto ſin." *Sermon on* Rom. vi. 4.

31. CHURCH OF ENGLAND: "As we be *buried* with Chriſt by our baptiſm into death, ſo let us daily die to ſin, mortifying and killing the evil motions thereof. And as Chriſt was raiſed up from death by the glory of the Father, ſo let us *riſe* to a new life, and walk continually therein." *Homily of the Reſurrec.*

32. H. ALTINGIUS: "As, in *ancient* times, the perſons to be baptized were *immerſed* into water, *continued under* water, and *emerged* out of the water, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38. ſo the old man in them died and was buried, and the new man roſe again, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. As, *now*, the perſons to be baptized are *ſprinkled* with water, ſo they are ſprinkled with the blood and Spirit of Chriſt, to the waſhing away of ſin, Acts. xxii. 16. Epheſ. v. 25, 26. Heb. ix. 14." *Loci Commun.* Pars I. Loc. XII. p. 200. *Explicat. Catechiſ. Palat.* Pars II. Quaeſt. LXIX. p. 311, 312.

33. WOLFIUS: "*Immerſion* into water, in former times, and a ſhort *continuance under* the water, practiſed by the ancient church, afforded the repreſentation of *a burial* in baptiſm." *Curæ.* ad Rom. vi. 4.

34. G. J. VOSSIUS: "In our baptiſm, by a *continuance under* water, the *burial* of the body of ſin, or the old Adam, is repreſented. The ſimilitude conſiſts in this: That as a corpſe is overwhelmed and preſſed by the *earth*; ſo, in baptiſm, a man is overwhelmed with *water*; and as a man is preſſed with water, ſo the power of ſin ſhould be preſſed in us

and enervated, that it may no longer drive us whither it pleases, or hinder our salvation." Apud WOLFIUM, *Curæ*, ad Rom. vi. 4.

35. Dr. CAVE: "As in *immersion* there are in a manner three several acts, *the putting the person into water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again*; so by these were represented Christ's *death, burial*, and *resurrection*; and in conformity thereunto, our *dying unto sin, the destruction of its power and our resurrection to a new course of life.* By the person's being put into water, was *lively represented* the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, and being washed from the filth and pollution of them. By his abode under it, which was a kind of burial in the water, his entering into a new state of death or mortification, like as Christ remained for some time under the state or power of death. Therefore, *as many as are baptized into Christ*, are said to be *baptized into his death*, and to be *buried with him by baptism into death*; that the *old man being crucified with him, the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth he might not serve sin*, for that *he that is dead, is freed from sin*, as the Apostle clearly explains the meaning of this rite. And then by his *emersion*, or rising up out of the water, was signified his entering upon a new course of life, differing from that he lived before; *that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*" *Primitive Christianity*, Part I. Chap. X. p. 204. Edit. 6.

36. LUTHER: "That the minister *dippeth* a child into the water, signifieth *death*; that he again bringeth him out of it, signifieth *life*. So Paul explains it, Rom. vi.—Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized, to be *intirely immersed*, as

as the *word imports* and the myſtery *ſignifies.*" *Opera*, Tom. II. *De Babylon. Servit.* fol. 79. in Dr. Du Veil, on Acts viii. 38.

37. Bp. Fouler: "Chriſtians being *plunged* into the water, in baptiſm, ſignifieth their undertaking and obliging themſelves, in a ſpiritual ſenſe, *to die*, and be *buried* with Jeſus Chriſt (which death and burial conſiſt, in an utter renouncing and forſaking of all their ſins) that ſo, anſwerably to his reſurrection, they may live a holy and godly life." *Deſign of Chriſtianity*, in Dr. Du Veil, on Acts viii. 38.

38. Dr. Sam. Clarke: "*We are buried with Chriſt by baptiſm into death; that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life*, Rom. vi. 4. In the *primitive* times, the manner of baptizing was by *immerſion*, or *dipping the whole body into the water*. And this manner of doing it, was a very ſignificant emblem of the *dying* and *riſing again*, referred to by St. Paul, in the abovementioned ſimilitude." *Expoſition of the Church Catechiſ.* p. 294. Edit. 6.

39. Cajetan: "*We are buried with him by baptiſm into death.* By our burying he declares our death, from the ceremony of baptiſm: becauſe he who is baptized, is *put under the water*, and by this bears a likeneſs of him that is *buried*, who is put under the earth. Now becauſe none are buried but dead men, from this very thing that we are buried in baptiſm, we are aſſimulated to Chriſt, when he was buried." *Ad* Rom. vi. 4. in Mr. Henry Laurence's *Treatiſe of Bap.* p. 71, 72.

40. Cornelius a Lapide: "We are baptized into a ſimilitude of the death of Chriſt. For they who are *put under the water*, allegorically repreſent Chriſt dead and buried." *Ad* Rom. vi. 4. in Mr. Hen. Laurence's *Treatiſe of Bap.* p. 73, 74.

41. Dr.

41. Dr. HAMMOND: "'Tis a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the *death* of Christ; the putting the person into the water, denotes and proclaims the *death* and *burial* of Christ." *On* Rom. vi. 3.

42. Bp. NICHOLSON: "The antient manner in baptism, the putting of the person baptized under the water, and then taking him out again, did well set forth these two acts; the first his *dying*, the second his *rising again*—Into the grave with Christ, we went not; for our bodies were not, nor could be buried with his: but in our baptism, by a kind of analogy or resemblance, while our bodies are under the water, we may be said to be buried with him." *Expos. Church Cat.* p. 174. in Mr. DAVYE'S *Bapt. of Adult Believ.* p. 114.

43. HEIDEGGERUS: "Baptism signifies the *death* and *burial*, both of Christ and of believers, in the abolition of the old man, as well initial in this life, as perfect in laying down the body of the sins of the flesh; the *resurrection* and *vivification*, first of Christ, then of ourselves; the *obedience* of Christ, even to death, which has the power of justifying and of delivering from death; *regenerating grace* and the Spirit, purifying our hearts; our *union* with Christ, and the *communion* of believers with him; and, lastly, a *resurrection* to life." *Historia Patriarch.* Tom. I. p. 565.

44. MOMMA: "As baptism represents the *death* and *burial* of our Lord, so also his *resurrection*, and sealeth our communion with him. Paul, therefore, teaches, Col. ii. 12. that *we are buried with him by baptism.* For the baptismal water, so far as it suffocates, is a manifest emblem of *death*; as it covers, of a *burial*; as it purifies, of *a resurrection.*" *De Statu Eccles.* Tom. II. C. V. § 199.

45. RIGALTIUS: "*Dipping* into the baptismal water,

water, denotes the perſon to be *deeply tinctured* with the Chriſtian faith; his being *overwhelmed*, ſignifies his *cleanſing* from moral ſtains and filth; and his *riſing up* out of the water, his reſurrection." *Annot.* in CYP. Epiſt. ad FIDUM. in Mr. STENNETT againſt RUSSEN, p. 71.

46. Dr. BARROW: "The action is *baptizing*, or *immerſing* in water. The object thereof, thoſe perſons of any nation, whom his miniſters can by their inſtruction and perſuaſion render diſciples, that is, ſuch as do ſincerely believe the truth of his doctrine, and ſeriouſly reſolve to obey his commandments.—The merſion alſo in water, and the emerſion thence, doth figure our death to the former [worldly defilements,] and receiving to a new life." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 518. 520. Edit. 1722.

47. Dr. JOHN EDWARDS: "Some of the Fathers—hold, that the Apoſtle's argument in the text [1 Cor. xv. 29.] is of this ſort; *If there ſhall be no riſing of the dead* hereafter, why is baptiſm ſo ſignificant a ſymbol of our dying and riſing again, and alſo of the death and reſurrection of Chriſt? For thoſe that were proſelytes to the Chriſtian religion, were interpreted to make an open profeſſion of theſe, in their being *plunged* into the baptiſmal water, and in being there overwhelmed and *buried*, as it were, in the conſecrated element. The *immerſion* into the water, was thought to ſignify the *death* of Chriſt; and their *coming out*, denoted his *riſing again*, did no leſs repreſent their own future reſurrection. On which account the miniſter's putting in of the Chriſtian converts into the ſacred waters, and his taking them out thence, are ſtiled by St. CHRYSOSTOM, *The ſign and pledge of deſcending into the ſtate of the dead, and of a return from thence.* And, thus becauſe

cauſe the waſhing and plunging of the newly admitted Chriſtians, was a viſible proof and emblem, firſt of Chriſt's, and then of their reſurrection from the grave; the forementioned Fathers have been induced to believe, that this paſſage of our Apoſtle, which I am ſpeaking of, hath a particular reſpect to that, and is to be interpreted by it. Nay, this ſeems to agree exactly with the language and tenour of our Apoſtle himſelf, who may be thought to be the beſt interpreter of his own words; *Know ye not*, ſaith he, *that ſo many of us as have been baptized into Chriſt, were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptiſm*, &c. Rom. vi. 3, 4." *Enquiry into four Remark. Texts*, p. 143, 144.

48. COCCEIUS: "*We are buried with him by baptiſm into death*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. We are baptized into death, by which the ſervitude of ſin is laid aſide; and thus a ſeal of our communion with him is beſtowed on us, that we may be conſidered as *buried* with him.—In baptiſm there is a reſemblance of our Lord's *death*." *Summa Doct. De Foed.* C. VI. § 209.

49. BP. TAYLOR: "*We are buried with him in baptiſm*, ſaith the Apoſtle. *In aqua tanquam in ſepulchro caput immergentibus vetus homo ſepelitur et ſubmergitur, deinde nobis emergentibus novus reſurgit inde:* So S. CHRYSOSTOM; *The old man is buried and drowned in the immerſion under water; and when the baptized perſon is lifted up from the water, it repreſents the reſurrection of the new man to newneſs of life.* In this caſe, therefore, the contrary cuſtom [of pouring, or ſprinkling] not only being againſt an eccleſiaſtical law, [of the Church of England] but againſt the *analogy* and *myſterious ſignification* of the ſacrament, is NOT TO BE COMPLIED WITH; unleſs in ſuch caſes that can be of themſelves ſufficient to

juſtify

juſtify a liberty in a ritual and ceremony, that is, a caſe of neceſſity." *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. III. C. IV. Rule xv. p. 645.

50. SIR NORTON KNATCHBULL: "The proper end of baptiſm ought not to be underſtood, as if it were a ſign of the *waſhing away* of ſin—but, properly, it is the ſign of *a reſurrection*, by faith in the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, of which *baptiſm* is a very lively and expreſſive figure; as was alſo the *ark* of Noah, out of which he returned, as it were, as out of a ſepulchre to a new life—And ſo was the *whale's belly*, out of which Jonah aroſe, after a three days burial; and the *cloud* and the *Red ſea*, in which the people of Iſrael are ſaid to have been *baptized*; that is, not *waſhed*, but *buried*. For all theſe were types of the ſame thing with baptiſm; not of the *waſhing away* of ſin, i. e. *the putting off the filth of the fleſh*; but of the *death* and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, and at the ſame time of ours. And to this truth, Apoſtles, Fathers, Schoolmen, and almoſt all Interpreters, give their ſuffrage. The thing is, indeed, ſo manifeſt, that there is no need of teſtimonies to confirm it: but becauſe there are not a few that otherwiſe teach, it will not be ſuperfluous, (that I may not ſeem to ſpeak without proper authority) out of innumerable teſtimonies to produce a few. We begin with St. PAUL. *Know ye not that ſo many as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptiſm into death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed from the dead by the Father of glory, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life*, Rom. vi. 3, 4. and Col. ii. 12. as alſo 1 Cor. xv. 29. *Elſe what ſhall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead riſe not at all?* As if he had ſaid, If there be no reſurrection, to what purpoſe

poſe are we baptized? In vain does the church uſe the ſign of baptiſm, if the dead riſe not. Similar teſtimonies frequently occur in the Fathers. For inſtance: *That believing on his death, by his baptiſm ye may be rendered partakers of his reſurrection,* IGNAT. *Ep. ad Trall. Baptiſm was given,* or appointed, *to ſet forth the death of our Lord. Ep. ad Philadel.* in the Name of IGNAT. *In baptiſm we perform the ſigns of his paſſion and reſurrection,* JUST. MART. *We know one ſaving baptiſm, ſeeing there is but one death for the world, and one reſurrection from the dead, of which baptiſm is a type,* BASIL. MAG. *Hear Paul ſpeaking aloud, They paſſed through the ſea, and were all baptized in the cloud and in the ſea. He calls their paſſage through the ſea* BAPTISM; *for it was an eſcape of death accompliſhed by water,* BASIL. SELEUC. *To be baptized and plunged, then to return and emerge, are a ſign of our deſcent to Hades, and of an aſcent from it,* CHRYSOST. *Baptiſm is a pledge and figure of the reſurrection,* AMBROS. *Baptiſm is an earneſt of the reſurrection,* LACTAN. *Dipping bears the reſemblance of death, and of a burial,* BERN. I might accumulate innumerable teſtimonies, but theſe, I think, are abundantly ſufficient to prove, that baptiſm is properly a type, of the *death* and *reſurrection* of Jeſus Chriſt;—and alſo of all believers that are baptized into the faith of him, from *a death* in ſin to *newneſs* of life; which if they do in this world, they have a moſt firm hope that after death, they ſhall, with Chriſt, ariſe to glory." *Animadverſ. in Lib. Nov. Teſt.* ad 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. p. 178, 179, 180. Oxon. 1677.

51. BP. HOADLY: "This latter expreſſion [*buried* with Chriſt and *riſing* with him] made uſe of by St. Paul, with relation to baptiſm, is taken from the cuſtom

cuſtom of *immerſion* in the firſt days; and from that particular manner of baptiſing proſelytes: by which they were firſt covered with water, and in a ſtate as it were of death and inactivity; and then aroſe out of it into a ſort of new ſtate of life and action. And if baptiſm had been *then* performed, as it is *now* amongſt us; we ſhould never have ſo much as heard of this form of expreſſion, of *dying* and *riſing again*, in this rite." *Works*, Vol. III. p. 890.

52. Dr. SCOTT: "Thoſe phraſes, *buried with Chriſt*, and *riſen with Chriſt*, are only the ſenſe and ſignification of that eaſtern cuſtom in baptiſm, *viz.* of *plunging* the baptized perſon under water, and *raiſing* him up again—and the ſignificancy of them the Apoſtle here [Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5.] plainly tells us, wholly refers to the *death*, and *burial*, and *reſurrection* of Chriſt; and therefore the *plunging* under water muſt neceſſarily refer to Chriſt's *death* and *burial*, and the *raiſing* up again, to his *reſurrection*." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 446, Edit. 1718.

53. Dr. TOWERSON: "One other particular there is, wherein I have ſaid the water of baptiſm to have been intended as *a ſign*; and that is in reſpect of that *manner* of application, which was ſome time uſed, I mean the *dipping* or *plunging* the party baptized in it. A ſignification, which St. Paul will not ſuffer thoſe to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epiſtles. For with reference to that manner of baptizing we find him affirming, Rom. vi. 4. That we are *buried with Chriſt by baptiſm into death*; *that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life*. And again, verſe 5. that *if we have been planted together in the likeneſs of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſs of his reſurrection*. To the ſame purpoſe, or rather yet more clearly,

clearly, doth that Apoſtle diſcourſe, where he tells us, Col. ii. 12. that as we are *buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, ſo we do therein riſe alſo with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the dead.* For what is this but to ſay, That as the deſign of baptiſm was to oblige men to conform ſo far to Chriſt's death and reſurrection, as to die unto ſin, and live again unto righteouſneſs; ſo it was performed by the ceremony of *immerſion*, that the perſon immerſed might, by that very ceremony, which was no obſcure image of a ſepulture, be minded of the precedent death; as, in like manner, by his coming again out of the water, of his riſing from that death to life, after the example of the Inſtitutor thereof?—The thing ſignified by the ſacrament of baptiſm, *cannot* otherwiſe be well repreſented, than by an *immerſion*; or, at leaſt, by ſome more general way of purification, than that of effuſion, or ſprinkling. For though the pouring, or ſprinkling, of a little water upon the face, may ſuffice to repreſent an internal waſhing, which ſeems to be the general end of Chriſt's making uſe of the ſacrament of baptiſm; yet can it not be thought to repreſent ſuch an *intire* waſhing, as that of new-born infants was, and as baptiſm may ſeem to have been intended for, becauſe repreſented as *the laver of regeneration:* That, though it do [not] require an immerſion, yet requiring ſuch a *general* waſhing at leaſt, as may extend to the whole body; as other than which cannot anſwer its type, nor yet that general, though internal purgation, which baptiſm was intended to repreſent. The ſame is to be ſaid *yet more* upon the account of our conforming to the death and reſurrection of Chriſt, which we learn from S. Paul, to have been the deſign of baptiſm to ſignify. For though that might, and was well enough repreſented, by

by the baptized perſon's being *buried in baptiſm*, and then *riſing out of it*, yet can it not be ſaid to be ſo, or at leaſt but *very imperfectly*, by the pouring out, or ſprinkling the baptiſmal water on him. But, therefore, as there is ſo much the more reaſon to repreſent the rite of immerſion, as the ONLY LEGITIMATE rite of baptiſm, becauſe THE ONLY ONE that can anſwer the ends of its inſtitution, and thoſe things which were to be ſignified by it; ſo, eſpecially if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great force) the general practice of the *primitive church*, was agreeable thereto, and the practice of the Greek church to this very day. For who can think either the one, or the other, would have been ſo tenacious of ſo troubleſome a rite, were it not that they were well aſſured, as they of the primitive church might very well be, of its being the ONLY INSTITUTED AND LEGITIMATE ONE." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 51, 52, 53. 56, 57, 58.

54. BENGELIUS: "He that is baptized, puts on Chriſt, the ſecond Adam; he is baptized, I ſay, into a whole Chriſt, and therefore alſo into his death: and it is like as if, in that very moment, Chriſt *ſuffered*, *died*, and was *buried*, for ſuch a man; and ſuch a man, ſuffered, died, and was buried with Chriſt." *Gnomon*, ad Rom. vi. 3.

55. BOCHARTUS: "The plunging, performed in baptiſm, ſignifies a *death* to ſin; and the emerſion, a *new life*." *Opera*, Tom. I. p. 1029. Edit. 1682.

56. VENEMA: "It is generally agreed among divines, that the communion of a believer with Chriſt and the effects of his obedience, by which the guilt, the pollution, and the puniſhment of ſin, are taken away, and ſo the remiſſion of ſin, ſanctification, and glorification are conferred, are preſented to view

in

in baptism: yet they do not sufficiently shew the way and manner in which that representation is made, and frequently speak with but little consistency. If, in baptism, the appearance of nothing but *washing* offered itself to our consideration, the thing would be easy. For seeing we are delivered from sin by the *obedience* of Christ, that would be readily understood by every one, as the cause of our purification, and as represented by *water*, in which is a cleansing virtue; especially, as the Scripture usually comprehends it under the emblem of *water*. But *washing* is neither the *only* idea, nor, as I think, the *principal* one, of this sacrament; but more truly, that of *suffocating*, and of bringing *death* on the flesh, an effect which water produces, seems here to be intended: as well, because the Apostle asserts it in express words, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12. as that baptism is elsewhere compared to the *deluge* and the *Red sea*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Why? Because in the *former* passage, Peter calls baptism αντιτυπον, the *antitype* of the water of the deluge; which word there, in a special and peculiar sense, denotes *a parallel*; by which is declared, that the deluge and baptism depict the same spiritual thing, and in a mystical representation answer one another: and, lastly, because the Apostle 1 Pet. iii. 21. seems to derive the idea of *washing*, from that power of *killing* which there is in water. For the death of sin, and of the flesh, really and properly consists in the washing away of spiritual filth; and therefore is rightly comprehended under the appearance of *putting to death*. When, therefore, Peter had compared baptism to the deluge, and so had attributed to it the power of cleansing; he immediately beholds in it σαρκος αποθεσιν ρυπου, *a putting off the filth of the flesh*. Further; That the idea of *washing* is not the first and the principal

principal ſignification of baptiſm, plainly appears from the rite of *immerſion*; in which way it uſed to be adminiſtered by *the Apoſtles* and *firſt Chriſtians*; for that leads us to think, not ſo much of *waſhing*, as of *putting to death*. Once more; The phraſe, *laver of regeneration*, which is uſed by Paul, Tit. iii. 5. does not ſo properly ſignify *waſhing*, as *renovation from death*.

"Let us try, then, in this way, to unfold the myſtery. The *water*, as is manifeſt, both from the immerſion of Chriſt, and the compariſon with the deluge and the Red ſea, denotes what is called, the *puniſhing juſtice* of God; by which a ſinner is not acquitted, without the public ſanctification of Jehovah's name, and which is uſually denominated the *wrath* of God. Into this *juſtice* Chriſt was immerſed. He took it on himſelf, when he was perfected by ſufferings and put to death; by which, he not only *bore*, but *placated*, the wrath of God. So that, being freed from the ſins which were laid upon him, he reſted in the ſepulchre in peace; for the curſe was then taken from the earth. But he obtained a more excellent ſign of ſin being expiated, and of juſtice being ſatisfied, in his reſurrection from the dead; when he was not only *juſtified*, but alſo obtained the whole promiſed glory, which is his moſt complete *emerſion*. This is the *baptiſm* of Chriſt, concerning which he ſpeaks, Matt. xx. 22. and this was repreſented by the baptiſm of water, that was adminiſtered to him by John. This is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, accompliſhed by his obedience and death; by which, being releaſed from a charge of guilt, he received a right to the promiſed bleſſings. Hence, further, a judgment muſt be formed concerning the baptiſm of believers; ſeeing their

their communion, not only with the *righteouſneſs* of Chriſt, but alſo with the *manner* of obtaining it, is, in a certain way, ſignified and ſealed; in which the myſtery of baptiſm conſiſts.

"That this may a little more plainly appear, it muſt be maintained, that the foreſaid communion with Chriſt conſiſts, both in the *imputation* of his righteouſneſs, as it is uſually called in the ſchools, and in a real *communication* of it. The *former*, for the ſake of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, confers juſtification by the gracious ſentence of God, and implies that believers were comprehended in their Sponſor; ſo that whatever Chriſt ſuffered, they may be eſteemed as having underwent. According to this benign interpretation, they are themſelves reputed as *immerſed* in the juſtice of God; and in Chriſt, they alſo poſſeſs a right of acceptance in a more excellent manner than if they themſelves had obtained it: which great myſtery of our faith is firſt of all preſented to view in baptiſm, and is made ſure to believers by a ſeal and pledge—This, if I may ſo ſpeak, is our *imputative* immerſion in the juſtice of God, and emerſion out of it; our *death* and *reſurrection*, which baptiſm exhibits to view." *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. II. C. XIV. § 9, 10, 11, 12.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Baptiſm being a gracious appointment of God, it muſt have an *important* meaning; and as it is a *poſitive* ordinance, the whole of its deſign muſt be fixed by divine inſtitution. For we have no more authority to *invent* a ſignification for any rite of holy worſhip, than we have to *appoint* the rite itſelf. The deſign of baptiſm, therefore, muſt be learnt from the New Teſtament; and from ſuch

ſuch parts of that ſacred Volume, as have an immediate reference to it. See CHAP. I.

REFLECT. II. Theſe learned authors are almoſt unanimous in conſidering baptiſm, as principally intended, by the great Legiſlator, to repreſent the *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, the Sponſor of his people; their *communion with him* in thoſe momentous facts; and their *intereſt in the bleſſings* thence reſulting. To confirm and illuſtrate which, they agree in applying the declarations of Paul, recorded in Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12. Now, if ſuch be the chief deſign of the ordinance; if theſe paſſages of holy writ be pertinently applied; and if there be any correſpondency between the ſign and the things that are ſignified by it; immerſion *muſt* be the mode of adminiſtration. —Nay, ſuppoſing that our *cleanſing from ſin* by the blood of Chriſt, were the firſt and the principal thing, intended and ſuggeſted by baptiſm; yet the ſame conſequence would naturally follow. For that purification muſt be either *partial*, or *complete*. Not the *former*, our oppoſers themſelves being judges. It muſt, therefore, be the *latter*. Of perfect purification, then, baptiſm is either an *expreſſive emblem*, or it is *not*. If *not*, why ſuch a ritual ſervice appointed, in preference to any other that might have been choſen, and would have exhibited the bleſſing in a far more ſtriking point of light? To this reaſoning an excellent Pædobaptiſt author gives atteſtation, when he obſerves; "That between an arbitrary ſign and the thing ſignified, there may be an agreement, or ſimilitude; which is the *reaſon* of one ſign being choſen, rather than another. And by how much the more a ſign is fitted to excite certain thoughts, and to repreſent the thing *ſignified*; by ſo much the

the better, or more uſeful, it is. Whence it follows, that the illuſtration of an inviſible thing, *depends on the* LIKENESS *there is, between the* SIGN *and the* SPIRITUAL OBJECT *to be repreſented in the mind**."—If, in baptiſm, there is an *expreſſive emblem* of perfect purification from ſin, *immerſion* muſt be the mode of adminiſtration; becauſe nothing ſhort of that repreſents a *total waſhing*. I may here venture an appeal to the common ſenſe of mankind; whether *pouring*, or *ſprinkling* a little water on the *face*, or an immerſion of the *whole body*, be better adapted to excite the idea of an *intire cleanſing*. See No. 53.

Mr. ADDINGTON tells us, that "the ſuppoſition of Paul's alluding here [Rom. vi. 3, 4.] to the mode of *immerſion* in baptiſm, as bearing a reſemblance to the burial and reſurrection of Chriſt, is intirely founded on a miſtaken interpretation of the paſſage. Without referring *in the leaſt* to that, or any other mode of adminiſtering the ordinance, Paul gives us an account of the nature and deſign of it; as *figuring*, not any ſcenes through which our Redeemer paſſed, but that *great change* on the heart of the true Chriſtian convert, which is effected by the waſhing of regeneration†." But were we *thus* to underſtand the paſſage, in oppoſition to theſe numerous and learned authors, immerſion would ſtill be the proper mode of adminiſtration. For ſuppoſing, though far from granting, that Paul means only to give an account of the ordinance, as figuring that great change on the heart of a real convert; yet while it is allowed, that he ſpeaks

* STAPFERI *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. III. § 1625.

† *Chriſtian Miniſt. Reaſ.* p. 44, 45.

ſpeaks of this important change under the notion of a *death*, a *burial*, and a *reſurrection*; and while it is maintained, that baptiſm is a *figure* of that change; we are naturally led to conclude, that IMMERSION is the only ſuitable mode. What *figure*, what *reſemblance* is there of a *death*, a *burial*, and a *reſurrection*, in ſprinkling a few drops of water on the face of a perſon? or, if there be any ſimilitude between the act and the things intended, it is of that kind which Mr. ADDINGTON himſelf deſcribes, when he ſays; "A *ſtrong* imagination, or a *prejudiced* mind, may find an object, and then point out a reſemblance in many particulars; but no reader of judgment and caution will ſtrain ſo obſcure an alluſion *." It was obſerved by AUSTIN long ago, that, "if ſacraments had not a *ſimilitude of thoſe things* of which they are ſacraments, they would not be ſacraments †." See CHAP. II. No. 33. We may, therefore, conclude, that whether baptiſm was intended to repreſent a *purification* from ſin, by the blood of Chriſt; or the *death* of the old, and the *quickening* of the new man, by the Spirit of God; or the *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection* of our divine Sponſor; immerſion is the only proper way of its adminiſtration, ſeeing there is no other mode of proceeding, which can ſo ſtrongly expreſs *any* of thoſe ideas: much leſs is pouring, or ſprinkling, adapted to expreſs them *all*, as immerſion does. Beſides, it is highly probable, as Bp. HOADLY juſtly obſerves, that if pouring, or ſprinkling, had been practiſed in the apoſtolic times, "we ſhould never have ſo much as heard, of *dying*, and *riſing again*," in baptiſm. See No. 51.

* Ut ſupra, p. 37.

† *Epiſtol. ad* BONIFACIUM *Epiſcop. Epiſt.* XXIII.

REFLECT. III. It is very obſervable, that ſome of theſe authors, finding it hard, if not impoſſible, to reconcile the obvious and genuine meaning of Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. and Col. ii. 12. with the natural import of their own practice; manifeſtly ſpeak, as if the ordinance of baptiſm repreſented *one thing* in the apoſtolic times, and *another thing* now. See No. 7. 32. What can be the reaſon of this? If there be only *one baptiſm*, as the Apoſtle aſſerts; and if that inſtitution be not altered ſince the time of Paul; it muſt have the very *ſame* ſignification, and that in the *ſame* degree: becauſe it muſt repreſent the *ſame objects*, with an *equal perſpicuity*, and in the *ſame way*, as when adminiſtered by that Ambaſſador of Chriſt. It muſt be intirely the ſame, if not corrupted, whether practiſed in *Judea*, or in *Britain*; in the *firſt*, or in the *eighteenth* century. How lamentable it is to think, that ſuch great men as H. ALTING, and F. TURRETTINE, ſhould ſacrifice thus to the love of hypotheſis!

REFLECT. IV. Some of theſe eminent Pædobaptiſts, far from viewing the metaphorical baptiſm of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, 1 Cor. x. 2. as militating againſt the neceſſity of immerſion; repreſent it as conveying the ſame leading idea with Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12: which latter paſſages are undoubtedly much in our favour. See No. 7. 50. 56.—To the opinion of TURRETTINE, KNATCHBULL, and VENEMA, on 1 Cor. x. 2. we may add the ſentiments of ſeveral others, whoſe characters are high in the learned world. GROTIUS, on the paſſage, expreſſes himſelf thus: "The cloud hung over the heads of the Iſraelites; and ſo the water is over thoſe that are baptized. The ſea ſurrounded them on each ſide; and ſo the water encompaſſes

compaſſes thoſe that are baptized."—WITSIUS, when remarking on the text, ſpeaks to this effect: "How were the Iſraelites *baptized in the cloud, and in the ſea*, ſeeing they were neither *immerſed* in the ſea, nor *wetted* by the cloud? It is to be conſidered, that the Apoſtle here uſes the term *baptiſm*, in a figurative ſenſe;—yet there is ſome agreement even in the external ſign. The ſea is water, and a cloud differs but little from water. The cloud hung over their heads; and ſo the water is over thoſe that are baptized—The ſea ſurrounded them on each ſide; and ſo the water, in regard to thoſe that are baptized *."—BRAUNIUS, in perfect agreement with No. 7. 50. 56. ſays; "The Iſraelites are ſaid to be *baptized in the cloud and in the ſea*; and it repreſented a *death*, and a *reſurrection*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. Rom. vi. 3, 4†."—Still more fully Mr. GATAKER, who expreſſes himſelf to this effect: "The going down of the Iſraelites into the bottom and middle of the ſea, and their coming up from thence to dry ground, have a great agreement with the *ancient* rite of baptiſm; in which the perſons to be baptized, *went down* into the water, and again *came up* out of it; as in Acts viii. 38, 39. Nay, further, as in the Chriſtian rite, when perſons are baptized, they are *overwhelmed*, and, as it were, *buried* in water, and ſeem in a manner, to be *buried with Chriſt*; and again, when they emerge, they ariſe as out of a ſepulchre, and are repreſented as riſen again with Chriſt, Rom. vi. 4, 5. Col. ii. 12: ſo the Iſraelites might ſeem, when paſſing through the waters of the ſea that were higher than their heads, to be *overwhelmed*, and as it were *buried*; and again to emerge and ariſe, when they eſcaped to

* *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. X. § 11.

† *Doctrina Fœd.* Loc. XVIII. C. X. § 7.

to the oppoſite ſhore*."—Mr. POOLE's Continuators thus; "Others more probably think that the Apoſtle uſeth this term [baptiſm] in regard of the great analogy betwixt baptiſm, as it was *then* uſed; the perſons baptized going down into the waters, and being dipped in them, and the Iſraelites going down into the ſea, that great receptacle of water: though the water at that time, was gathered on heaps, on either ſide of them, yet they ſeemed *buried* in the water, as perſons in that age were then baptized."—Mr. BURKITT, on the place, has the following note: "The Iſraelites are here ſaid to be *baptized in the cloud, and in the ſea:* that is, the cloud which overſhadowed them, did ſometimes bedew and ſprinkle them; and the Red ſea, through which they paſſed, had its waters gathered into two heaps, one on the right hand, and the other on the left, betwixt which the Iſraelites paſſed, and in their paſſage ſeemed to be *buried* in the waters; as perſons *in that age were put under the water*, when they were baptized: and thus were Iſrael baptized in the cloud and in the ſea."

Other learned Pædobaptiſts there are, who, when commenting on the text, do not ſeem to have the leaſt ſuſpicion of its being inimical to the neceſſity of immerſion. For inſtance: CAMERON, on the paſſage, ſays: "How were the Iſraelites baptized in the cloud and in the ſea? for they were neither *dipped* in the ſea, nor *wetted* by the cloud." And BENGELIUS thus; "They were baptized in the cloud, inaſmuch as they were under it; and in the ſea, ſeeing they paſſed through it: but neither the cloud, nor the ſea, wetted, much leſs *immerſed* them (though ſome conjecture from Pſalm lxviii. 9. and

* Apud POLI *Synopſin*, in loc.

and cv. 39. that a miraculous rain fell from the cloud) nor is the appellation of *baptiſm* extant in the narrative of Moſes. Nevertheleſs, Paul very agreeably denominates it thus, becauſe a cloud, and the ſea, are both of a watery nature; therefore Paul ſays nothing of the fiery pillar: and becauſe the cloud and the ſea *withdrew the fathers from ſight*, and returned them almoſt in a ſimilar manner, as the *water does thoſe that are baptized**." See CHAP. IV. No 20.—Now, either theſe learned authors were extremely inadvertent; or they were very generous to their opponents, in giving up an argument well adapted to defend their own practice; or the generality of our Engliſh Pædobaptiſts proceed on a groſs miſtake, when they plead this paſſage againſt us.

REFLECT. V. If, then, ſo many of the moſt eminent Pædobaptiſts agree, that the term baptiſm, properly ſpeaking, ſignifies *immerſion*; and if, to ſo great a degree, they further unite in declaring, that the principal facts repreſented by the ordinance, are, the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, as the ſubſtitute of his choſen people; their communion with him in thoſe facts, and their intereſt in the bleſſings procured by them; we have reaſon to conclude, on their own principles and conceſſions, that there neither is, nor can be, any valid plea for pouring or ſprinkling, as a proper mode of adminiſtration. This muſt be the caſe, except it ſhould appear on further inquiry, that the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians did not practiſe what the name of the ordinance is allowed to imply, and the deſign of the inſtitution ſeems to require. We muſt therefore conſider, in the following Chapter, what ſome of the moſt learned Pædobaptiſts have to ſay on that part of the ſubject.

CHAP.

* *Gnomon*, in loc.

CHAP. IV.

The Practice of John the Baptiſt, of the Apoſtles, and of the Church in ſucceeding Ages, in regard to the Manner of adminiſtering the Ordinance of Baptiſm.

N. B. Candour demands we ſhould here acknowledge, that though theſe numerous and learned authors have expreſſed themſelves in the following manner; yet many of them inſiſt upon it, as highly probable, that the Apoſtles did ſometimes adminiſter baptiſm by pouring or ſprinkling.

WITSIUS: "It is *certain*, that both John the Baptiſt, and the diſciples of Chriſt, ordinarily practiſed *immerſion*; whoſe example was followed by the ancient church, as VOSSIUS hath ſhewn by producing many teſtimonies from the Greek and Latin writers. *Diſp.* I. *de Baptiſmo*, Theſ. VI. and alſo HOORNBEEK, *de Baptiſmo Veterum*, Sect. IV." *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 13.

2. BEAUSOBRE and LENFANT: "*In the water —in the Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe words do very well expreſs the ceremony of baptiſm, which was at *firſt* performed by *plunging the whole body* in water, as alſo the copious effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt, on the day of Pentecoſt." *Note* on Matt. iii. 11. Eng. Tranſlat.

3. ANONYMOUS: "If we have regard to the manner in which the idea of baptiſm is naturally adapted to the ſituation of a guilty creature, zealous to expreſs his abhorrence of ſin; or to the general practice of the Jewiſh, as well as other Eaſtern

Eaſtern nations; to the *example* of our Lord, and of his diſciples; and to the moſt plain and obvious conſtruction of the Greek language; we ſhall be inclined to believe that Infant *ſprinkling* is not an inſtitution of Chriſtianity, but a *deviation* from the original rite, which was performed by *dipping*, or *plunging* into water—The arguments by which the Pædobaptiſts ſupport their practice and doctrine appear to us to be ſo *forced* and *violent*, that we are of opinion, nothing but the general prevalence of Infant ſprinkling could have ſo long ſupported it." *Engliſh Review*, for Nov. 1783. p. 351.

4. GURTLERUS: "The action in this element of water, is *immerſion*; which rite continued for a *long time* in the Chriſtian church, until, in a *very late age*, it was changed into ſprinkling: of which an example is *hardly to be found* in ancient hiſtory, except what relates to the *Clinics*, or ſick perſons, who, when confined to their beds, were to be initiated by the ſign of the covenant of grace. Hence baptized perſons are ſaid to have *deſcended into the water*, and to be *buried with Chriſt into death*, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38. Rom. vi. 4: for they who are immerſed in water, are covered with it, and as it were *buried* in it, until they ariſe out of it." *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Cap. XXXIII. § 117, 118.

5. Bp. DAVENANT: "In the ancient church, they not only ſprinkled, but *immerſed* thoſe whom they baptized." *Expoſ. Epiſt. ad Coloſ.* in Cap. ii. 12.

6. PICTETUS: "As to the manner of adminiſtering baptiſm, it was uſual in ancient times for *the whole body to be immerſed in water*; as appears from Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23, and Acts viii. 38. This rite might be uſed in thoſe warm countries; and, it muſt be confeſſed, that ſuch a rite *moſt happily*

pily represented that grace by which our sins are as it were drowned, and we raised again from the abyss of sin." *Theolog. Christ.* L. XIV. C. IV. § 17. Genev. 1696.

7. CAJETAN: "Christ ascended out of the water: therefore he was baptized by John, not by *sprinkling*, nor by *pouring* water upon him, but by *immersion*." *Ad* Matt. iii. 16. in Mr. HENRY LAWRENCE'S *Treatise of Bap.* Chap. v. p. 62, 63.

8. PISCATOR: "Ὑδατα πολλα, signifies *many rivers*; as ὑδωρ, in the singular number, denoted the river Jordan. This is mentioned to signify the ceremony of baptism which John used; that is, *immersing* the whole body of a person standing in the river. Whence Christ being baptized of John in Jordan, is said to *ascend out of the water*, Matt. iii. The same manner was observed by Philip, Acts viii. 38." *Ad* Joh. iii. 23. in Mr. HENRY LAWRENCE'S *Treatise of Bap.* Chap. v. p. 64.

9. Abp. SECKER: "*Burying*, as it were, the person baptized, in the water, and raising him out of it again, *without question* was anciently the more usual method: on account of which St. Paul speaks of baptism, as representing both the *death* and *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, and what is grounded on them, our being *dead and buried* to sin, renouncing it, and being acquitted of it; and our *rising again* to walk in newness of life." *Lectures on the Catechism*, Lect. XXXV.

10. MASTRICHT: "The sign *representing*, or the element in baptism, is water;—the sign *applying*, is washing,—whether it be performed by *immersion*, Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. Acts viii. 38. which ONLY was used by the Apostles and primitive churches; because it is not only *more agreeable* in the

the warm Eaſtern countries, but alſo more *ſignificant*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. or whether it be performed by *ſprinkling*, which is not deſtitute of its foundation and analogy, 1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. x. 22. compare Iſa. lii. 15. and Ezek. xxxvi. 25. and is *more agreeable* in theſe countries." *Theoret. Pract. Theolog.* L. VII. C. IV. § 9.

11. CALVIN: "Here we perceive how baptiſm was adminiſtered among *the ancients*; for they *immerſed the whole body* in water. Now it is the prevailing practice for a miniſter only to *ſprinkle* the body or the head." *Comment.* in Acts viii. 38.

12. SPANHEMIUS: "To be baptized is denominated by Paul, a being *buried*, according to the *ancient manner* of baptizing. For *immerſion* is a kind of *burial*; and *emerſion*, a *reſurrection*, to which the Apoſtle alludes, Col. ii. 12. So Chriſt, being baptized, *went up out of* the water, Matt. iii. 16. The ſame is related concerning the Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts viii. 38." *Dubiorum Evang.* Pars III. Dub. XXIV. § 2.

13. VITRINGA: "The act of baptizing, is the *immerſion* of believers in water. This expreſſes the force of the word. Thus alſo it was performed by Chriſt and the Apoſtles." *Aphoriſmi Sanct. Theolog.* Aph. 884.

14. LEYDECKERUS: "Trine *immerſion* was uſed in the firſt times, according to the number of Divine Perſons in the Deity, Matt. xxviii. 19." *Idea Theolog.* L. VII. C. V. § 7.

15. MARLORATUS: "From theſe words [John iii. 23.] it may be gathered, that baptiſm was performed by John and Chriſt, by *plunging of the whole body*." *Ad* Joan. iii. 23.

16. Mr. STACKHOUSE: "The obſervation of the Greek church, in relation to this matter [the

baptiſm of Chriſt] is this; That he who *aſcended out* of the water, muſt firſt *deſcend* down into it: and conſequently, that baptiſm is to be performed, not by *ſprinkling*, but by *waſhing* the body. And indeed, he muſt be ſtrangely ignorant of the Jewiſh rites of baptiſm, who ſeems to doubt of this; ſince, to the due performance of it, they required the immerſion of the whole body to ſuch a degree of nicety, that if any dirt was upon it, that hindered the water from coming to the part, they thought the ceremony not rightly done. The Chriſtians, no doubt, took this rite from the Jews, and followed them in their *mannner* of performing it. Accordingly, ſeveral authors have ſhewn, that we read no where in *ſcripture* of any one's being baptized, but by *immerſion*; and from the Acts of Councils, and antient Rituals, have proved, that this manner of *immerſion* continued (as much as poſſible) to be uſed for *thirteen hundred years* after Chriſt. But 'tis much to be queſtioned, whether the *prevalence of cuſtom*, and the *over fondneſs of parents*, will, in theſe cold climates eſpecially, ever ſuffer it to be reſtored." *Hiſtory of the Bib.* B. VIII. Chap. I. p. 1234, 1235. Note. See alſo Dr. WHITBY, on Matt. iii. 16.

17. Mr. BURKITT: "Obſerve the manner of the adminiſtration of baptiſm to the Eunuch; he *went down into* the water, and was baptized by Philip. In thoſe hot countries it was uſual ſo to do, and we do not oppoſe the lawfulneſs of dipping in ſome caſes, but the neceſſity of dipping in all caſes." *Expoſ. Notes*, on Acts viii. 38.

18. Mr. JOHN WESLEY: "*Buried with him*—Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by *immerſion*." *Note*, on Rom. vi. 4.

19. CONFESSION

19. CONFESSION OF HELVETIA: "Baptiſm was inſtituted and conſecrated by God; and the firſt that baptized was John, who DIPPED Chriſt in the water, in Jordan." *Harmony of Confeſſ.* p. 395.

20. ZANCHIUS: "The ancient church uſed to *immerſe* thoſe that were baptized. Thus Chriſt *went down into* Jordan and was baptized; as alſo others that were baptized by John. Of this thing, and of immerſion, the paſſage of the people through the midſt of the ſea, was a type; concerning which the Apoſtle ſpeaks 1 Cor. x. *They were baptized*, ſaith he, *in the ſea*." *In Epiſt. ad Epheſ. Opera*, Tom. VI. p. 217.

21. HOORNBEEKIUS: "We do not deny,—that, in the *firſt examples* of perſons baptized, they went into the water, and were *immerſed*." *Socin. Confut.* L. III. C. II. Sect. I. Tom. III. p. 268.

22. DAILLE: "It was a cuſtom heretofore, in the *ancient church*, to *plunge* thoſe they baptized over head and ears in the water—This is ſtill the practice both of the Greek and the Ruſſian church, even at this very day." *Right Uſe of the Fathers*, B. II. p. 148.

23. SALMASIUS: "The ancients did not baptize otherwiſe than by *immerſion*, either once, or thrice." Apud WITSIUM, *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 13.

24. Mr. BOWER: "Baptiſm by *immerſion*, *was* UNDOUBTEDLY *the Apoſtolical practice*, and was never diſpenſed with by the church, except in caſe of ſickneſs, or when a ſufficient quantity of water could not be had. In both theſe caſes baptiſm, by aſperſion, or ſprinkling, was allowed, but in no other." *Hiſt. of the Popes*, Vol. II. p. 110. Note. See alſo p. 121. Note.

25. Mr.

25. Mr. POOLE's CONTINUATORS: "A great part of thoſe that went out to hear John were *baptized*, that is, *dipped* in Jordan—It is true, the firſt baptiſms of which we read in holy writ, were by *dippings* of the perſons baptized. It was in an hot country, where it might be at any time without the danger of perſons lives; where it may be, we judge it *reaſonable*, and MOST RESEMBLING *our burial with Chriſt by baptiſm into death:* but we cannot think it neceſſary, for God loveth mercy rather than ſacrifice; and the thing ſignified by baptiſm, viz. *the waſhing away the ſouls ſin by the blood of Chriſt*, is in ſcripture expreſſed to us by *pouring* and *ſprinkling*, Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Heb. xii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 2.—It is from this [John iii. 21.] apparent, that both Chriſt and John baptized by *dipping* the body in water; elſe they need not have ſought places where had been a *great plenty* of water—He [Paul] ſeems here [Rom. vi. 4.] to allude to the manner of baptizing in thoſe warm Eaſtern countries, which was to *dip*, or *plunge*, the party baptized; and as it were to *bury* him for a while under water. See the like phraſe Col. ii. 12." *Annotations*, on Matt. iii. 6. and xxviii. 19, 20. John iii. 21. Rom. vi. 4.

26. RAVANELLUS: "In the *firſt inſtitution* of baptiſm, when adult perſons were chiefly baptized, and that in a warm country, *immerſion* was uſed; as appears from Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 36, 38, 39. Rom. vi. 4, 5. But in the preſent age, in which infants are generally baptized, and that in cold countries, *aſperſion* is practiſed, according to the law of charity; yet without any injury to the nature of the ſacrament." *Bibliotheca*, ſub voce, BAPTISMUS. Genev. 1652.

27. MARKIUS

27. MARKIUS: "The action to be performed in the adminiſtration of baptiſm, is *waſhing* the body with water; which we think is rightly done, I. by *immerſion*. (1) As in that act there is the *greateſt waſhing* of the whole body. To ſignify which the word is, therefore, (2) moſt frequently uſed. (3) It was commonly practiſed by John the Baptiſt, the diſciples of Chriſt (Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. Acts. viii. 38.) and the firſt Chriſtians. And (4) to which reference is had, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 12." *Compend. Theolog. Chriſt.* Cap. XXX. § 11.

28. MOSHEIM: "The exhortations of this reſpectable meſſenger, [John the Baptiſt] were not without effect; and thoſe who, moved by his ſolemn admonitions, had formed the reſolution of correcting their evil diſpoſitions, and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of *immerſion*, or baptiſm, Matt. iii. 6. Joh. i. 22.——The ſacrament of baptiſm was adminiſtered in this [the Second] century, without the public aſſemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpoſe, and was performed by *immerſion* of the whole body in the baptiſmal font—Thoſe adult perſons, that deſire to be baptized [among the Collegiants] receive the ſacrament of baptiſm, according to the *ancient and primitive manner* of celebrating that inſtitution, even by *immerſion*." *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Cent. I. Part I. Chap. III. § 3. Cent. II. Part II. Chap. IV. § 8. and Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part II. Chap. VII. § 1.

29. Bp. TAYLOR: "The cuſtom of the *ancient* churches was not *ſprinkling*, but *immerſion*; in purſuance of the *ſenſe* of the word [baptize] in the commandment, and the *example* of our bleſſed Saviour.

Now

Now this was of ſo ſacred account in their eſteem, that they did not account it lawful to receive him into the clergy, who had been only *ſprinkled* in his baptiſm, as we learn from the Epiſtle of CORNELIUS to FABIUS of Antioch, apud EUSEB. lib. VI. cap. 43." *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. III. Chap. IV. Rule XV. p. 644.

30. BURMANNUS: "*Immerſion* was uſed by the Jews, the *Apoſtles*, and the *primitive* church, eſpecially in warm countries. To this, various forms of ſpeaking, uſed by the Apoſtles, refer, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12. Gal. iii. 27. But in the Weſt, and colder parts of the world, ſprinkling prevailed." *Synopſ. Theolog.* Tom. II. Loc. XLIII. C. VI. § 9.

31. Mr. JOHN TRAPP: "There were, ſaith one, many ceremonies in baptiſm uſed in the *primitive* church; viz. putting off old cloaths, *drenching* in water, ſo as to ſeem to be *buried* in it, putting on new cloaths at their coming out, to which Paul alludeth in theſe words." *Commentary*, on Col. ii. 12.

32. GROTIUS: "That baptiſm uſed to be performed by *immerſion*, and not by *pouring*, appears both from the *proper ſignification* of the word, and *the places* choſen for the adminiſtration of the rite, Joh. iii. 23. Acts viii. 38. and alſo from the many *alluſions* of the Apoſtles, which *cannot* be referred to ſprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." Apud POLUM, *Synopſ.* ad Matt. iii. 6.

33. CASTALIO and CAMERARIUS: "*And were baptized.* That is, they were *immerſed* in water." Apud POLUM, *Synopſin*, ad Matt. iii. 6.

34. BEZA: "*Ye have put on Chriſt*—This phraſe ſeems to proceed from the ancient cuſtom of *plunging* the adult, in baptiſm." *Annotat.* ad Gal. iii. 27.

35. Mr. BINGHAM: "The antients thought that

that *immerſion*, or burying under water, did more lively repreſent the death, and burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt; as well as our own death unto ſin, and riſing again unto righteouſneſs: and the diveſting or uncloathing of the perſon to be baptized, did alſo repreſent the putting off the body of ſin, in order to *put on the new man, which is created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs*—Perſons thus diveſted, or unclothed, were uſually baptized by *immerſion*, or dipping, of their whole bodies under water—There are a great many paſſages in the Epiſtles of St. Paul, which plainly refer to this cuſtom; and as this was the *original apoſtolical* practice, ſo it continued to be the *univerſal* practice of the church for many ages, upon the ſame ſymbolical reaſons as it was firſt uſed by the Apoſtles." *Origin. Eccleſ.* Vol. I. p. 521, 522. Fol.

36. MENOCHIUS and ESTIUS: "The Apoſtle, in Rom. vi. 4. alludes to the rite of *immerſion*, when the body is, as it were, *buried*, and in a little while drawn out again, as from a ſepulchre." Apud POLUM, *Synopſ.* ad Rom. vi. 4.

37 LAMPE: "*Becauſe there was much water there.* That plenty of water was neceſſary to the adminiſtration of baptiſm by *immerſion*, to a very great multitude of people, is readily acknowledged." *Comment. in Evangel. ſecund* JOAN. ad Cap. iii. 23.

38. LIMBORCH: "Baptiſm, then, conſiſts in waſhing, or rather *immerſing* the whole body into water, as was cuſtomary in the *primitive times*—The Apoſtle alludes to the manner of baptizing, not as practiſed at this day, which is performed by *ſprinkling* of water; but as adminiſtered of old, in the primitive church, by *immerſing* the whole body in water, a ſhort continuance in the water, and a ſpeedy emerſion out of the water." *Compleat Syſt. of Divin.* B. V. Chap.

Chap. xxvii. Sect. I. *Comment. in Epiſt. ad Rom.* in Cap. vi. 4.

39. Mr. JOHN CLAUDE: "In his baptiſm, he [Chriſt] is *plunged* in the water." *Eſſay on Compoſ. of a Serm.* Vol. I. p. 272. Mr. ROBINSON's Tranſlation.

40. H. ALTINGIUS: "This baptiſmal waſhing, in warm countries and *ancient times*, was performed by *immerſion into* water, *a continuance under* water, and an *emerſion out* of water; as the practice of John the Baptiſt, Matt. iii. 6, 16. Joh. iii. 23. of Chriſt's Apoſtles, Joh. iii. 22. and iv. 1, 2. and of Philip, Acts viii. 38. and alſo the *ſignification* of theſe rites teach, Rom. vi. 4." *Loci Commun.* Pars I. Loc. xii. p. 199.

41. HOSPINIANUS: "John the Baptiſt baptized Chriſt *in Jordan*, and Philip baptized the Eunuch in *a river*, Acts viii. Lydia alſo, together with her houſehold, ſeems to have been baptized *in a river*, near to Philippi, at which prayers were uſually made, Acts xvi." *De Templis*, L. II. C. IV. p. 80.

42. CURCELLAEUS: "Baptiſm was performed by *plunging the whole body into water*, and not by *ſprinkling of a few drops*, as is now the practice. For *John was baptizing in Ænon near Salim, becauſe there was much water; and they came and were baptized*, Joh. iii. 23. Nor did the diſciples that were ſent out by Chriſt, adminiſter baptiſm afterwards in any other way: and this is more agreeable to the ſignification of the ordinance, Rom. vi. 4. I am, therefore, of opinion, that we ſhould endeavour to reſtore and introduce this primitive rite of immerſing, if it may be done without offence to the weak; otherwiſe it ſeems better to tolerate this abuſe, than to raiſe a diſturbance in the church about it—They are now *ridiculed*, who deſire to be baptized, not by *ſprinkling*, but

but as it was performed in the *ancient* church, by an *immerſion of the whole body* into water." *Relig. Chriſt. Inſtitut.* L. V. C. 2. et apud HEIDEGG. *Libert. Chriſt. a Lege Cib. Vet.* C. XIV. § 3.

43. WOLFIUS: "That *baptiſmal immerſion* was practiſed in the *firſt ages* of the Chriſtian church, many have ſhewn from the writings of the ancients.—Some learned Chriſtians, therefore, have judged, that the ſame rite of immerſion ſhould be recalled into practice at this day, leſt the *myſtical ſignification* of the ordinance ſhould be loſt—Here the Apoſtle alludes to *immerſion* in baptiſm, practiſed of old." *Curac*, ad Rom. vi. 4. et Col. ii. 12.

44. G. J. VOSSIUS: "That John the Baptiſt and the Apoſtles *immerſed* perſons whom they baptized, there is *no doubt*. For thus we read; *And they were baptized in Jordan—And Jeſus, when he was baptized, went up ſtraightway out of the water*, Matt. iii. 6, 16. It is alſo written, Joh. iii. 23. *John baptized in Enon near to Salim, becauſe there was much water there.* And, Acts viii. 38. it is ſaid; *They both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch.* And that the *ancient church* followed theſe examples, is very clearly evinced by innumerable teſtimonies of the Fathers." *Theſes Theolog. Diſput. Prima, De Bap.* Theſ. VI. p. 349, 350.

45. Sir PETER KING: "To me it ſeems evident, that their [the primitive Chriſtians] uſual cuſtom was, to *immerſe*, or *dip, the whole body*." *Enquiry into the Conſtitut. Diſcip.* &c. *of Prim. Church*, Part II. Chap. IV. § 5.

46. Abp. TILLOTSON: "*Anciently*, thoſe who were baptized, put off their garments, which ſignified the putting off the body of ſin; and were *immerſed and buried in the water*, to repreſent their death

death to ſin; and then did riſe up again out of the water, to ſignify their entrance upon a new life. And to theſe cuſtoms the Apoſtle alludes, Rom. vi. 2—6. Gal. iii. 27." *Works* Vol. I. Serm. VII. p. 179. Edit. 8vo.

47. FRID. SPANHEMIUS, F: "This rite of *immerſion*, and of *bringing out* of the baptiſmal water, was common and promiſcuous in the *apoſtolic age*. Whence the Apoſtle alludes to it, as a rite common to *all Chriſtians*, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12." *Diſputat. De Bap. pro Mortuis*, p. 16. annexed by Dr. DU VEIL, to his *Literal Expoſition of the Acts*.

48. Sir JOHN FLOYER: "The Chriſtian baptiſm—was performed by *immerſion*, in England, and all parts, at the *firſt planting* of Chriſtianity." *Hiſt. of Cold Bathing*, p. 11.

49. Abp. USHER: "Some there are, that ſtand ſtrictly for the particular action of *diving*, or *dipping*, the baptized under water, as the only action which the inſtitution of the ſacrament will bear; and our Church allows *no other*, except in caſe of the child's weakneſs; and there is expreſt in our Saviour's baptiſm, both the *deſcending into the water*, and the *riſing up*." *Sum and Subſ. of the Chriſt. Relig.* p. 413. Edit. 6.

50. MOMMA: "They were wont to go *down into the water*. Philip and the Eunuch *went down into the water*, Acts viii. 38. Compare Verſe 39. Chriſt alſo, being baptized, *went up from the water*, Matt. iii. 16. Therefore, he *went down into the water* to be baptized." *De Statu Eccleſ.* Tom. II. C. V. § 193.

51. THEOD. HASAEUS: "Though, in the time of the Apoſtles, the cuſtom was not known which prevailed in the following ages; namely, that perſons,

ſons, immediately after their baptiſm, were cloathed with white garments which they wore for a week afterwards, and thence were called, *Albati*, *Candidati*; yet ſeeing they were *intirely immerſed* in water, they could not be baptized without putting off, and again putting on, their cloaths." *Biblioth. Bremenſ.* Claſs. IV. p. 1042. 1043.

52. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "We grant that baptiſm then, [in the primitive times] was by waſhing *the whole body*; and did not the differences of our *cold* country, as to that hot one, teach us to remember, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*, it ſhould be ſo *here*—It is *commonly confeſſed* by us to the Anabaptiſts, as our commentators declare, that in the Apoſtles times the baptized were *dipped over head* in the water, and that this ſignified their profeſſion, both of believing the burial and reſurrection of Chriſt; and of their own *preſent* renouncing the world and fleſh, or dying to ſin and living to Chriſt, or riſing again to newneſs of life, or being buried and riſen again with Chriſt, as the Apoſtle expoundeth, in the forecited texts of Col. iii. [Col. ii.] and Rom. vi. And though (as is before ſaid) we have thought it lawful to *diſuſe* the manner of dipping and to uſe leſs water, yet we preſume not to change the uſe and ſignification of it." *Paraphraſe on the New Teſt.* at Matt. iii. 6. *Diſputations of Right to Sacram.* p. 70.

53. Bp. BURNET: "They [the primitive miniſters of the goſpel] led them into the water, and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they at firſt *laid them down in the water*, as a man is laid in *a grave*, and then they ſaid thoſe words; *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* Then they raiſed them up again, and clean garments were put on them: from whence came

came the phraſes, of being *baptized into Chriſt's death*; of our being *buried with him by baptiſm into death*; of our being *riſen with Chriſt*, and of our *putting on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; of *putting off the old man*, and *putting on the new*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. Col. ii. 12. Col. iii. 1. 10. Rom. xiii. 14. After baptiſm was thus performed, the baptized perſon was to be farther inſtructed in all the ſpecialities of the Chriſtian religion, and in all the rules of life that Chriſt had preſcribed." *Expoſ.* XXXIX. *Articles*, p. 374, 375.

54. BRAUNIUS: "Chriſt went down into Jordan, to be baptized by John, Matt. iii. The ſame thing ſeems to be intimated by the Apoſtle, when he ſpeaks of being *buried by baptiſm*, Col. ii. 12. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27." *Doctrina Fœd.* Pars IV. Cap. XXI. § 8.

55. ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES: "*Were baptized.* Waſhed by *dipping* in Jordan, as Mark vii. 4. Heb. ix. 10.—*Buried with him by baptiſm.* See Col. ii. 12. In this phraſe the Apoſtle ſeemeth to allude to the *antient manner* of baptiſm, which was to *dip* the parties baptized, and as it were to *bury them under the water* for a while, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up, to repreſent the burial of our old man, and our reſurrection to newneſs of life." *Annotations*, on Matt. iii. 6. and Rom. vi. 4.

56. Mr. JOSEPH MEDE: "There was no ſuch thing as *ſprinkling*, or ῥαντισμος, uſed in baptiſm in the Apoſtles days, nor *many ages* after them." *Diſcourſe on* Tit. iii. 5. *Works*, p. 63. Edit. 1677.

57. Dr. CAVE: "The party to be baptized was *wholly immerged*, or put under water, which was the almoſt *conſtant and univerſal cuſtom* of thoſe times; whereby they did *more notably* and *ſignificantly* expreſs

preſs the three great ends and effects of baptiſm." *Primitive Chriſtianity*, Part. I. Chap. X. p. 203.

58. Dr. TOWERSON: "What the practice of thoſe [primitive] times was,—will need no other proof than reſorting to *rivers*, and other ſuch like receptacles of waters, for the performance of that ceremony, as that too becauſe there was *much water there*. For ſo the Scripture doth not only affirm concerning the baptiſm of John, Matt. iii. 5, 6, 13. Joh. iii. 23; but both intimate concerning that which our Saviour adminiſtered in Judea (becauſe making John's baptiſm and his to be ſo far forth of the ſame ſort, Joh. iii. 22, 23.) and expreſsly affirm concerning the baptiſm of the Eunuch, which is the only Chriſtian baptiſm the Scripture is any thing particular in the deſcription of: The words of St. Luke (Acts viii. 38.) being, that *both Philip and the Eunuch went down into a certain water*, which they met with in their journey, in order to the baptizing of the latter. For what need would there have been either of the Baptiſt's reſorting to *great confluxes* of water, or of Philip and the Eunuch's going down into this, were it not that the baptiſm both of the one and the other, was to be performed by *an immerſion?* A very little water, as we know it doth with us, ſufficing for an effuſion, or ſprinkling." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 55, 56.

59. BOSSUET: "The baptiſm of St. John the Baptiſt, which ſerved for a preparative to that of Jeſus Chriſt, was performed by *plunging*——When Jeſus Chriſt came to St. John, to raiſe baptiſm to a more marvellous efficacy in receiving it, the Scripture ſays, *That he went up out of the water of Jordan*, Matt. iii. 16. Mark i. 10.—In fine, we read not in the Scripture that baptiſm was otherwiſe adminiſtered; and

and we are able to make it appear, by the acts of Councils, and by the ancient Rituals, that for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, baptiſm was thus adminiſtered *throughout the whole church*, as far as was poſſible." In Mr. STENNET *againſt* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 175, 176.

60. Mr. CHAMBERS: "In the primitive times this ceremony [baptiſm] was performed by *immerſion*; as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the *original ſignification* of the word." *Cyclopaedia*, Article, BAPTISM. Edit. 7.

61. Mr. GEORGE WHITEFIELD: "*It is certain*, that in the words of our text [Rom. vi. 3, 4.] there is an alluſion to the manner of baptiſm, which was by *immerſion*; which our own Church allows, and *inſiſts* upon it that children ſhould be immerſed in water, unleſs thoſe that bring the children to be baptized aſſure the miniſter that they cannot bear the plunging." *Eighteen Sermons*, p. 297.

62. Dr. DODDRIDGE: "And after Jeſus was baptized, as ſoon as he *aſcended out of the water* to the bank of Jordan—And John was alſo at that time baptizing at Enon, which was a place near Salim, a town on the Eaſt ſide of Jordan; and he particularly choſe that place, becauſe there was *a great quantity* of water there, which made it very convenient for his purpoſe. Nothing, ſurely, can be more evident, than that πολλα ὑδατα, *many waters*, ſignifies *a large quantity of water*; it being ſometimes uſed for the Euphrates, Jer. li. 13. *Septuag.* To which I ſuppoſe there may be an alluſion, Rev. xvii. 1. Compare Ezek. xliii. 2. and Rev. i. 15. xiv. 2. xix. 6. where *the voice of many waters* does plainly ſignify the roaring of a high ſea.—Conſidering how frequently bathing was uſed in thoſe hot countries, it

is

is not to be wondered, that baptiſm was *generally adminiſtered* by immerſion; though I ſee no proof that it was *eſſential* to the inſtitution. It would be *very unnatural* to ſuppoſe that they [Philip and the Eunuch] *went down to the water*, merely that Philip might take up *a little water in his hand* to pour on the Eunuch. A perſon of his dignity had, no doubt, many veſſels in his baggage, on ſuch a journey through ſo deſert a country; a precaution abſolutely neceſſary for travellers in thoſe parts, and never omitted by them. See Dr. SHAW's Travels, Pref. p. 4.—*Buried with him in baptiſm.* It ſeems the part of candor to confeſs, that here [Rom. vi. 4.] is an alluſion to the manner of baptizing by *immerſion*, as moſt uſual in thoſe *early times*; but that will not prove this particular circumſtance eſſential to the ordinance." *Fam. Expoſ.* on Matt. iii. 16. Joh. iii. 23. Acts viii. 38. Rom. vi. 4.

63. M. JURIEU: "The Antients uſed to *plunge* perſons into the water, calling on the adorable Trinity." In Dr. GALE's *Reflect. on Dr.* WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 193.

64. M. LE CLERC: "The manner of baptizing at that time, by *plunging* into the water thoſe whom they baptized, was an image of the burial of Jeſus Chriſt." In Dr. GALE's *Reflect.* p. 193.

65. VENEMA: "It is *without controverſy*, that baptiſm, in the primitive church, was adminiſtered by *immerſion* into water, and *not by ſprinkling*; ſeeing John is ſaid to have baptized *in Jordan*, and where there was *much water*, as Chriſt alſo did by his diſciples in the neighbourhood of thoſe places, Matt. iii. and John iii. Philip alſo, *going down into the water*, baptized the Eunuch, Acts viii. To which alſo the Apoſtle refers, Rom. vi.—Nor is there

there any neceſſity to have recourſe to the idea of *ſprinkling* in our interpretation of Acts ii. 41. where *three thouſand ſouls* are ſaid to be added to Chriſt by baptiſm; ſeeing it might be performed by *immerſion*, equally as by *aſperſion*, eſpecially as they are not ſaid to have been baptized at the *ſame time*. —The *eſſential* act of baptizing, in the ſecond Century, conſiſted, not in *ſprinkling*, but in immerſion, into water, in the name of each Perſon in the Trinity. Concerning immerſion the words and phraſes that are uſed ſufficiently teſtify; and, that it was performed in a river, a pool, or a fountain—To the *eſſential* rites of baptiſm, in the third Century, pertained *immerſion*, and not aſperſion; except in caſes of neceſſity, and it was accounted a *half*-perfect baptiſm—*Immerſion*, in the fourth Century, was one of thoſe acts that were conſidered as *eſſential* to baptiſm;—nevertheleſs, aſperſion was uſed in the laſt moments of life, on ſuch as were called *Clinics*,—and alſo where there was not a ſufficient quantity of water—BEVERIDGE, on the fiftieth *Apoſtolical Canon*, aſſerts, that the ceremony of ſprinkling began to be uſed inſtead of immerſion, about the time of Pope GREGORY, in the ſixth Century; but without producing any teſtimony in favour of his aſſertion; and it is, undoubtedly, a miſtake. MARTENE declares in his *Antiq. Eccleſ. Rit.* L. I. P. I. C. I. that in all the Ritual books, or Pontifical MSS. ancient or modern, that he had ſeen, *immerſion is required*; except by the Cenomanenſian, and that of a more modern date, in which pouring on the head is mentioned. In the Council of Ravenna alſo, held in the year thirteen hundred and eleven, both immerſion and pouring are left to the determination of the adminiſtrator

trator: and the Council of Niſmes, A. D. 1284, permitted pouring, if a veſſel could not be had; therefore, only in caſe of neceſſity—The Council of Celichith, in the beginning of the ninth Century, forbade the pouring of water on the heads of infants, and commanded that they ſhould be immerſed in the font—Baptiſm was adminiſtered by *immerſion*, in the twelfth Century—In the thirteenth Century, baptiſm was adminiſtered by *immerſion*, thrice repeated; yet ſo, that one immerſion was eſteemed ſufficient, as appears from AUGERIUS de Montfaucon. That was a ſingular ſynodal appointment, under JOHN de Zurich, biſhop of Utrecht, A. D. 1291. which runs thus; *We appoint, that the head be put three times in the water, unleſs the child be weak, or ſickly, or the ſeaſon cold; then water may be poured, by the hand of the prieſt, on the head of the child, leſt, by plunging, or coldneſs, or weakneſs, the child ſhould be injured and die.*" *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Secul. I. § 138. Secul. II. § 100. Secul. III. § 51. Secul. IV. § 110. Secul. VI. § 251. Secul. VIII. § 206. Secul. XII. § 45. Secul. XIII. § 164.

66. ALTMANNUS: "In the primitive church, perſons to be baptized were not *ſprinkled* but *intirely immerſed* in water; which was performed according to the example of John the Baptiſt. Hence all thoſe alluſions; ſeeing, by immerſion, they plainly ſignified a *burial*; by the following emerſion out of the water, a *reſurrection*; and agreeable to theſe ideas, are thoſe paſſages of ſcripture to be explained, which refer to this rite. See Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. Col. ii. 12. and Gal. iii. 27." *Meletem. Philolog. Critic.* Tom. III. Exercit. in 1 Cor. xv. 29. § 8.

67. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS: "The Son of God was *dipped* in the water of Jordan, by the hand of John the Baptiſt—Philip baptized the Eunuch in

a river, Acts viii. 38. It ſeems alſo that Lydia and her houſehold, at Philippi, were baptized in a river, at which prayers were uſually made, Acts xvi. 13, 16." *Cent.* I. L. I. C. IV. p. 118. L. II. C. VI. p. 381.

68. Dr. HAMMOND: John baptized "in a *river*, in Jordan, Mark i. 5. in a confluence of *much water*, Joh. iii. 23. *becauſe*, as it is added, *there was much water there:* and, therefore, as the Jews, writing in Greek, call thoſe lakes wherein they waſh themſelves κολυμβηθραι; ſo, in the Chriſtian church, the βαπτιστηριον, or veſſel which contained the baptiſmal water, is oft called κολυμβηθρα, a *ſwimming* or *diving* place." *Annotations*, on Matt. iii. 1.

69. CHAMIERUS: "Immerſion of the whole body was uſed *from the beginning*, which expreſſes the force of the word *baptize*; whence John baptized in a river. It was afterwards changed into *ſprinkling*; though it is uncertain when, or by whom, it commenced." *Panſtrat. Cathol.* L. V. C. 3.

70. Bp. FELL: "The *primitive faſhion* of immerſion under the water, repreſenting our death, and elevation again out of it, our reſurrection, or regeneration." *On the Epiſt. of Paul, Note*, on Rom. vi. 4.

71. DUTCH ANNOTATORS: "The Apoſtle ſeems here [Rom. vi. 3.] to allude to the manner of baptizing, much uſed in thoſe warm Eaſtern countries; where men were *wholly dipped* into the water, and remained a little while under water, and afterwards roſe up out of the water: to ſhew that their dipping into and remaining in the water, is a repreſentation of Chriſt's death and burial; and the riſing up out of the water, of his reſurrection." *On* Rom. vi. 3.

72. Bp. STILLINGFLEET: "Rites and cuſtoms apoſtolical are altered; therefore men do not think that apoſtolical practice doth bind: for if it did, there

there could be no alteration of things agreeable thereunto. Now let any one conſider but theſe few particulars, and judge how far the pleaders for a divine right of apoſtolical practice do look upon themſelves as bound now to obſerve them: as *dipping* in baptiſm, &c. yet none look upon themſelves as bound to obſerve them now, and yet *all* acknowledge them to have been the practice of the Apoſtles." *Irenicum*, Part II. Chap. VI. p. 345.

73. H. HULSIUS: "Some interpret 1 Cor. xv. 29. concerning the baptiſm of *Clinics*, or perſons confined to their beds;—but this baptiſm changed *dipping* into *ſprinkling*, and was not practiſed in the time of Paul." *Comment. in Iſrael. Priſ.* p. 819.

74. DEYLINGIUS: "It is manifeſt, that, while the Apoſtles lived, the ordinance of baptiſm was adminiſtered, not out of a veſſel, or a baptiſtry, which are the marks of later times; but out of *rivers* and *pools*, and that, not by *ſprinkling*, but by *immerſion*—So long as the Apoſtles lived, as *many* believe, immerſion *only* was uſed; to which afterwards, perhaps, they added a kind of *pouring*, ſuch as the Greeks practiſe at this day, having performed the trine immerſion." *Obſervat. Sac.* Pars II. Obſerv. XLIV. § 3. Pars III. Obſ. XXVI. § 2.

75. HEIDEGGERUS: "*Plunging*, or *immerſion*, was moſt commonly uſed, by John the Baptiſt and the Apoſtles——It is of no importance whether baptiſm be performed by *immerſion* into water, as of old in the warm Eaſtern countries, and even at *this day*; or by *ſprinkling*, which was *afterwards* introduced in colder climates." *Corpus Theolog. Chriſt.* Loc. XXV. § 35. Tom. II. p. 442.

76. Mr. EDWARD LEIGH: "The ceremony uſed in baptiſm, is either *dipping*, or *ſprinkling*: dipping is the *more ancient*. *At firſt*, they went down into

into *the rivers*; afterwards they were dipped in *the fonts*——ZANCHIUS and Mr. PERKINS prefer (in perſons of age and hot countries, where it may be ſafe) the ceremony of *immerſion under the water*, before that of ſprinkling, or laying on the water, as holding more analogy to that of Paul, Rom. vi. 4." *Body of Div.* B. VIII. Chap. VIII. p. 665.

77. Mr. LOCKE: "We Chriſtians, who by baptiſm were admitted into the kingdom and church of Chriſt, were baptized into a ſimilitude of his death: We did own ſome kind of death, by being *buried under water*, which being buried with him, i. e. in conformity to his burial, as a confeſſion of our being dead, was to ſignify, that as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead, into a glorious life, with his Father, even ſo we being raiſed from our typical death and burial in baptiſm, ſhould lead a new ſort of life." *Paraphraſe* on Rom. vi. 4.

78. J. J. WETSTENIUS: "John baptized in the river Jordan, in Enon, becauſe there was *much water*, Joh. iii. 23; and Chriſt, when he was baptized, went down *into the water*, Matt. iii. 16. And Chriſtians, in baptiſm, are ſaid to *put off their cloaths*, Gal. iii. 27; to be *waſhed*, Tit. iii. 5. and to be *buried under the water*, Rom. vi. 4; all which are expreſſive, not of *ſprinkling*, but of *dipping*." *Comment.* ad Matt. iii. 6.

79. ROELL: "It is *certain*, that immerſion into water, and emerſion out of it, obtained—in Chriſtian baptiſm, *in the beginning*." *Exegeſis Epiſt. ad Col.* in Cap. ii. 12.

80. Mr. WALKER: "Mr. ROGERS was for retrieving the uſe of *dipping*, as witneſſed to by *antiquity*, approved by *Scripture*, required by the *Church*, (as then it was, except in caſe of weak-

 and ſymbolical with *the things ſignified* in baptiſm:

baptiſm: Which I could wiſh as well and as heartily as he, in order to making of peace in the church, if that would do it." In Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 475.

81. Dr. WHITBY: "It being ſo expreſsly declared here, [Rom. vi. 4.] and Coloſ. ii. 12. that we are *buried with Chriſt in baptiſm*, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to ſin, being taken hence; and this *immerſion* being religiouſly obſerved BY ALL CHRISTIANS FOR THIRTEEN CENTURIES, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into ſprinkling, even without *any allowance* from the Author of this inſtitution, or any licenſe from any Council of the church, being that which the Romaniſt ſtill urgeth to juſtify his refuſal of the *cup to the laity*; it were to be wiſhed, that this cuſtom might be again of general uſe, and aſperſion only permitted, as of old, in caſe of the Clinici, or in preſent danger of death." *Note*, on Rom. vi. 4.

82. Dr. WALL: "Their [the primitive Chriſtians] general and ordinary way was to baptize by *immerſion*, or *dipping* the perſon, whether it were an infant, or grown man, or woman, into the water. This is ſo plain and clear by an infinite number of paſſages, that as one cannot but *pity the weak endeavours* of ſuch Pædobaptiſts as would maintain the negative of it; ſo alſo we ought to *diſown* and ſhew a *diſlike* of the PROFANE SCOFFS which ſome people give to the Engliſh Antipædobaptiſts, merely for their uſe of dipping. 'Tis one thing to maintain, that that circumſtance is not abſolutely neceſſary to the eſſence of baptiſm; and another, to go about to repreſent it as *ridiculous* and *fooliſh*, or as *ſhameful* and *indecent*; when it was

was in all probability the way by which our bleſſed Saviour, and for *certain* was the moſt uſual and ordinary way by which the ancient Chriſtians, did receive their baptiſm——'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as of honeſty, to refuſe to grant to an adverſary what is certainly true, and may be proved ſo. It creates a jealouſy of all the reſt that one ſays——'Tis plain that the ordinary and general practice of St. John, the Apoſtles, and primitive church, was to baptize by *putting the perſon into the water*, or cauſing him to go into the water. Neither do I know of *any Proteſtant* who has denied it; and but *very few* men of learning that have denied, that where it can be uſed with ſafety of health, it is the *moſt fitting way*——John iii. 23. Mark i. 5. Acts viii. 38. are *undeniable proofs* that the baptized perſon went ordinarily *into the water*, and ſometimes the baptiſt too. We ſhould not know, by theſe accounts, whether the *whole body* of the baptized was put under water, head and all; were it not for two later proofs, which ſeem to me to put it *out of queſtion*. One, that St. Paul does twice, in an alluſive way of ſpeaking, call baptiſm *a burial*; which alluſion is not ſo proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the arm-pits, &c. as it is if their whole body was immerſed. The other, the cuſtom of the near ſucceeding times——As for *ſprinkling*, I ſay as Mr. BLAKE at its firſt coming up in England, *Let them defend it that uſe it*—They [who are inclined to Preſbyterianiſm] are hardly prevailed on to leave off that SCANDALOUS cuſtom of having their children, though never ſo well, baptized out of a *baſon*, or *porringer*, in a bed-chamber; hardly perſuaded to bring them to church; much farther from having them *dipped*, though never ſo able to endure it."

Hiſt.

Hiſt. of Inf. Bap. Part II. Chap. II. p. 462, 463. *Defence of Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 129, 131, 140, 147. —See, alſo, Dr. ROBERTSON's *Hiſt. Emp.* CHARLES V. Vol. III. p. 78. OEDERI *Catecheſ. Racovienſ. Profligat.* p. 98. MILTON's *Parad. Loſt*, B. XII. l. 438. 441, 442. *Encyclopaed. Britan.* Article, BAPTISM, Vol. II. p. 995. Dr. PRIESTLEY's *Hiſt. of Corrup. of Chriſtianity*, Vol. II. p. 66, 67.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Here we have a great number of the moſt reſpectable characters for ſolid learning, and many of them for eminent piety. They appear to teſtify what they know and what they believe, concerning an ancient fact; a fact, in an acquaintance with which, the purity of a divine inſtitution and obedience to the will of our Lord, are not a little involved. The principal queſtion on which they are cited to give their opinion, is; Whether John the Baptiſt, and the Apoſtles of Chriſt, adminiſtered baptiſm by *immerſion?* A queſtion this, which regards both *fact* and *right*. Becauſe, in whatever manner thoſe venerable men and lights of the world performed that inſtitution, we are bound to believe it was *right*; for they had too much knowledge and too much integrity to adminiſter this branch of holy worſhip in a wrong way. Beſides, they were not ignorant that their practice was to be viewed as a *pattern*, and to be conſidered as *law*, by the ſucceeding diſciples of Chriſt.—The character and profeſſion of thoſe authors, who appear to give their thoughts on this important ſubject, leave no room for ſuſpicion that they are biaſſed in favour of the Baptiſts: becauſe impartiality itſelf muſt confeſs, that if their judgement be under the influence

influence of predilection, it moſt probably lies on the contrary ſide. Many of them alſo are beyond the reach of ſuſpicion, in regard to their knowledge of eccleſiaſtical antiquity. What, then, is their avowed opinion, on the ſubject before us?

On a brief review of their declarations we find, That immerſion was practiſed by JOHN the Baptiſt, by the *Apoſtles* of Chriſt, and by the *primitive* Chriſtians. See No *Paſſim*—That our LORD *himſelf* was immerſed by the venerable John. See No 4. 6, 7, 8. 10. 16. 20. 26, 27. 29. 40, 41. 44. 54. 59. 67. 78. 82.—That ſome of them expreſsly aſſert, and many of them implicitly allow, that the Scripture *no where* ſpeaks of any being baptized, but by immerſion. See No 10, 23. 32. 42. 56. 58, 59, 60. 65. 69. 72. 74.—That the practice of immerſion *gave occaſion* for ſome very ſingular and emphatical phraſes to be uſed by the Apoſtles. See No 9. 12. 18. 30. 34. 38. 46, 47. 53. 55. 61, 62. 71. 77.—That the baptiſm of the three thouſand, Acts ii. 41. affords *no objection* to the univerſal practice of immerſion, in thoſe times. See No 65. ——That plunging was the general and almoſt univerſal practice, for a *long courſe of ages*, See No 4. 59. 65. 81.——That the churches of Helvetia *acknowledge*, and the church of England, in common caſes, *requires*, immerſion. See No 19. 49. 81.—That one of theſe authors knew of no *Proteſtant*, who had denied immerſion to have been the general practice of apoſtolic times; and of but *very few* learned men, who denied its being the *fitteſt*, if a regard to health do not forbid. See No 82.—That the cuſtom of *ſprinkling*, is abſolutely indefenſible. *Ibid.*—That they who ridicule the practice of immerſion, deſerve a *ſevere cenſure*. *Ibid.*—That *ſprinkling* of infants, is not an inſtitution of Chriſt. See

No 3.

No 3.—And, that a *reſtoration* of the primitive practice, is very deſirable. See No 42, 43. 80, 81. —Such is the verdict which theſe Pædobaptiſts give, on the cauſe before us.

REFLECT. II. Now, is it not ſtrange, ſtrange to aſtoniſhment, that ſo many eminent men ſhould thus agree in bearing teſtimony to immerſion, as the *apoſtolic example*; when it is notorious, that their own practice was very different? Is it not a wonderful phenomenon in the religious world, that ſuch a number of the moſt learned Lutherans, Calviniſts, Arminians, and Roman Catholics, abroad; together with Engliſh Epiſcopalians, Preſbyterians, and Independents; ſhould all unite in one atteſtation, reſpecting the *primitive* mode of adminiſtering this ordinance; even while they oppoſed the Baptiſts, for conſidering immerſion as abſolutely neceſſary to a compliance with the divine command; and while they greatly differed among themſelves, in reſpect of ſeveral particulars relating to baptiſm? To what can this remarkable agreement with us, as to primitive practice, be aſcribed? And what is the reaſon of their differing ſo much among themſelves? The true reaſon, I take to be this: When they unite in declaring their views of the apoſtolic pattern, they have clear, ſtrong, indubitable evidence, ariſing from, the meaning of the *name* which the ordinance bears—the *deſign* of the inſtitution—and the *inſpired narrative* of the firſt Chriſtian churches. Each of them feels the ground on which he treads. Hence their union; and here they agree with us.—On the other hand, when they differ among themſelves, about the *foundation* of an infant's claim on the ordinance; concerning the *degree* of neceſſity, and the *utility*, of Pædo-

baptiſm; about *ſponſors*, the ſign of the *croſs*, and ſo on; they argue on *general* principles and *moral* conſiderations. This kind of argumentation is quite foreign to the nature of *poſitive* rites; and yet from ſuch principles, by a long train of deductions, they infer their various rules of proceeding, in the adminiſtration of baptiſm. Hence they differ among themſelves. Nor need we wonder. For, as moral conſiderations are exceedingly various, and as the application of each to practice may be greatly diverſified; ſo, according to the complexion of the principle adopted, as the foundation of an argument, will the natural inference be, whether it regard the mode or the ſubject of any ordinance. Whenever ideas therefore, of moral fitneſs, of expediency, or of neceſſity, uſurp the place of divine precepts and apoſtolic examples, relating to poſitive inſtitutions of the Chriſtian church; the moſt learned and the beſt of men will always differ in their concluſions, and that in proportion as their notions of what *is* fitneſs, expediency, or neceſſity, vary. For it is notorious, that while one eſteems this or the other thing extremely proper and highly uſeful to the cauſe of religion; another deſpiſes it as abſurd, or deteſts it as injurious. But, when our divine Lord, addreſſing his diſciples in a poſitive command, ſays, "It *ſha'l* be ſo;" or when, ſpeaking by an apoſtolic example, he declares, "It *is* thus;" all our own reaſonings about fitneſs, expediency, or utility, muſt hide their impertinent heads. The fineſt powers of reaſon, in this caſe, have nothing to do, but only to conſider the natural, the obvious import of his language, and then ſubmit. To reaſon any further here, is only to ſeek a plauſible excuſe for rebellion againſt the ſovereign majeſty of HIM who is king in Zion.

REFLECT.

REFLECT. III. It is, I think, a good rule which Dr. OWEN gives, relating to divine inſtitutions, when he ſays; "That which is *firſt* in any kind, gives *the meaſure* of what follows in the ſame kind*." With Dr. OWEN, Abp. TILLOTSON perfectly agrees, when he expreſſes himſelf thus; "This is reaſonable, that the *firſt* in every kind, ſhould be the *rule* and *pattern* of the reſt, and of all that follow after; becauſe it is likely to be the moſt perfect. In proceſs of time, the beſt inſtitutions are apt to decline, and by inſenſible degrees to ſwerve and depart from their firſt ſtate; and therefore it is a good rule to preſerve things from corruption and degeneracy, often to look back to the *firſt inſtitution*, and by that to correct thoſe imperfections which almoſt unavoidably creep in with time†." To the judgement of theſe two eminent authors, I will add the ſuffrage of Mr. HENRY, who ſpeaks with a profeſſed regard to baptiſm, in the following manner: "When a queſtion was put to our Lord Jeſus, by the Phariſees, concerning marriage, he refers them to the inſtitution and original law, Matt. xix. 3, 4. to teach us to go by the *ſame rule* in other ordinances. Run up the ſtream of the obſervation (which in a long courſe ſometimes contracts filth) to the ſpring of the inſtitution, and ſee *what it was from the beginning*‡." —Theſe directions perfectly coincide with that maxim of unerring wiſdom, to which Mr. HENRY refers; *From the beginning it was not ſo.* Conſequently, if, at the beginning of the Chriſtian church, baptiſm was *immerſion*, as appears by the foregoing teſtimonies; it ought to be ſo *now*. This muſt

* *Inquiry into Orig. Nat. and Conſtitut. of Churches*, Pref. p. 54.

† *Works*, Vol. II. p. 170. Fol. 1722.

‡ *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 18.

muſt be the caſe, except there be evidence of our ſovereign Lord having repealed his firſt order, and altered the original plan of proceeding: but no ſuch pretence is made by our Brethren.

It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that though the numerous and learned authors juſt produced, conſider immerſion as generally practiſed by the Apoſtles; yet many of them think it highly probable, that pouring, or ſprinkling, was uſed on ſome occaſions, in thoſe primitive times. A ſuppoſition this, too much like that of the Roman Catholics, when they ſpeak to the following effect: "Though wine was *commonly* uſed by thoſe who partook of the holy ſupper, in the apoſtolic age; yet a participation of that element is not *eſſential* to the ordinance: nor is it demonſtrable, that the Apoſtles always uſed it, when they celebrated the death of their Lord. Nay, the contrary ſeems rather to be implied, when they call the adminiſtration of that ſolemn appointment, *Breaking of* BREAD.' —But we anſwer more directly, by aſking; Whether the Apoſtles, and their aſſociates, did not adminiſter baptiſm in obedience to *divine law?* Whether the commanding terms in every law, divine or human, ſhould not be underſtood in their *moſt commonly received* ſenſe; except there be ſome intimation of a different acceptation being intended? Whether the primary and moſt common meaning of the word *baptiſm*, be not *immerſion?* And, whether the act of ſolemnly immerſing a perſon, do not *more fully expreſs* the great deſign of the ordinance, than pouring or ſprinkling? Now, if learning and impartiality unite in demanding an affirmative anſwer to theſe queries, as appears from quotations in CHAP. II. III. IV. VI. there is not the leaſt reaſon to doubt, but the Apoſtles *always* practiſed immerſion.

Very few of our oppoſers, if I miſtake not, have dared

dared abſolutely to deny, either the lawfulneſs of immerſion, or that the Apoſtles ever uſed it. But if *lawful*, it muſt be ſo in virtue of a divine command, or ſome authentic example; becauſe it is a poſitive rite, and when performed by us, it is as a religious duty. If, then, a divine precept require immerſion, by what authority is pouring or ſprinkling at all uſed? for, that plunging, pouring, and ſprinkling, are three different acts, will not admit of a doubt. Or, does our Lord, in the ſame enacting term, of the ſame law, warrant *all* thoſe different modes of proceeding, and compliment the human will with a liberty of chooſing that which is moſt agreeable? Were that the caſe, it would be a ſtrange law indeed, when conſidered as enacted by our divine Sovereign! Have we any inſtance of this kind in the ſacred Records? Nay, the majeſty of a human legiſlator would be diſgraced by ſuch a conduct.—On the other hand, if pouring, or ſprinkling, be *naturally* inferrible from our Lord's command (and he muſt be of a perverſe turn, who pleads for an inference confeſſedly *unnatural*;) and if the Apoſtles, or the primitive church, ever practiſed the one or the other; it is hard to imagine, how they came to uſe immerſion *at all:* either of the former, conſidered ſimply in itſelf, being more eaſy, and more agreeable to human feelings, both in regard to the adminiſtrator and the candidate. So, had Abraham, and his male poſterity, been left at their option, to circumciſe either a *finger*, or the *foreſkin*; we might have ſafely concluded, without any expreſs information, which they would have preferred—ſo preferred, as *never* to have practiſed the other. It is far more natural, therefore, to conclude, that immerſion was changed into *ſprinkling*, than that ſprinkling was laid aſide for *immerſion:*

and

and of this Pædobaptiſts themſelves will furniſh us with ſufficient evidence, in a following Chapter.

Further: Had the Apoſtles practiſed pouring, or ſprinkling, a *baſon*, or ſomething ſimilar, muſt have been frequently uſed on the ſolemn occaſion. Is it not a wonder, then, that the ſacred Hiſtorians no where *mention* ſuch a domeſtic utenſil, nor any thing like it, as employed by the adminiſtrator, when recording ſo many inſtances of the ordinance being adminiſtered? Our Brethren, perhaps, may ſay; "This was a trifling circumſtance, and not worthy of particular notice." We find, however, that when our Lord waſhed the feet of his diſciples, as a baſon was uſed, it is expreſsly mentioned, Joh. xiii. 5. Now, that pedilavium being a ſingle inſtance, not intended as an ordinance of divine worſhip, nor yet, in a *literal* ſenſe, as a binding example on the followers of Chriſt; it is quite unaccountable that the inſpired hiſtoric pen ſhould ſo expreſsly mark the uſe of a baſon on that occaſion, and yet paſs over in ſilence its *very frequent* ſervice, at the adminiſtration of baptiſm: for its uſe muſt have been frequent indeed, had the mode of proceeding, adopted by our oppoſers, been then practiſed. Of what importance was it for us to know, that our Lord *poured water into a baſon*, before he performed the condeſcending act; in compariſon with an explicit account of ſomething ſimilar, if any thing ſimilar there had been, prior to the adminiſtration of baptiſm, and preparatory to it? How comes it that theſe expreſſions, or others equivalent; "Peter, or Paul, or Philip (for inſtance) *poured water into a baſon, and baptized ſuch an one*," are intirely unknown to the New Teſtament? How came the inſpired page to ſpeak, not of *baſons*, but of *rivers*;

not

not of a *little*, but of *much water*; not of *bringing* water to the candidate, but of his *going to*, and *into* the water; not of *wetting*, but of *burying*; when the adminiſtration and the deſign of the ordinance are deſcribed? Were any of our opponents to publiſh a hiſtory of his own practice, in regard to baptiſm, he muſt either uſe different language from that of inſpiration, reſpecting this matter; or expoſe himſelf to a violent ſuſpicion of having deſerted the cauſe he once eſpouſed. His character would certainly appear problematical among his brethren, and his conduct bear a diſpute, whatever he might intend. If, therefore, the ſacred Hiſtorians practiſed aſperſion, their conduct, as writers, was extremely remarkable: for though, on that ſuppoſition, they ſet the example which our oppoſers follow, as to the mode of adminiſtration; yet, in their narrations, they adopt ſuch expreſſions, and mention ſuch circumſtances, relating to baptiſm, as would make a very ſingular figure from the pen of an Engliſh Pædobaptiſt, when deſcribing his own conduct and views in reference to that inſtitution. Were my Reader to peruſe a narrative of baptiſmal practice, penned by a foreigner, or by any anonymous author, of whom he had no knowledge but what was obtained from his writings; were he to find him ſpeak, of chooſing a place for the adminiſtration of baptiſm, in preference to others, becauſe there was *much water* there—of his baptizing in a *river*—of *going down*, with the candidate, *into*, and *coming up out of the water*;—were he to find him reminding baptized perſons, of their having been *buried* and *raiſed* with Chriſt, in baptiſm; and were he to obſerve, that the author always uſes either one word or another, for the ordinance, which, in its primary acceptation, ſignifies *immerſion*, but never talks of *bringing water*

to

to the candidate, or of uſing a *baſon*, as preparatory to the adminiſtration; he would, I preſume, be ready to ſay, "This author, whoever he be, writes like a *Baptiſt*. He ſpeaks the language of one that conſiders baptiſm, as nothing ſhort of immerſion. If, however, contrary to all appearances, he practiſe *aſperſion*, and intended to inform the public of that particular, he has choſen a very ſingular method in which to do it, and has expreſſed himſelf in the moſt awkward manner imaginable."—Now, ſuppoſing the Apoſtles to have practiſed pouring, or ſprinkling, it is highly reaſonable for us to conclude, that the inſpired penmen *intended* to inform us of it. But if ſo, how comes it, that a ſerious and uniform adoption of their *various expreſſions*, reſpecting the adminiſtration and meaning of the ſacred rite, by a perſon whoſe theological ſentiments we learn only from his writings, is enough to raiſe an immediate ſuſpicion that he approves of immerſion? And how comes it about, that our preſent oppoſers never talk of going to a place where there is *much water*; of going *into* the water, and of *coming up out of* the water, when they ſpeak of performing the ſolemn ſervice? A ſimilarity of *practice*, in other caſes, uſually produces a ſimilarity of *language*, when that practice is narrated. This therefore, is a preſumptive evidence, that the apoſtolic practice was different from theirs. For, while they forbear the uſe of this remarkable apoſtolic language, it looks as if they were conſcious, that it would not properly expreſs the facts to which it ſhould be applied.

REFLECT. IV. The baptiſm of the *three thouſand*, Acts ii. 41. has been frequently pleaded as a preſumptive argument in favour of pouring or ſprinkling. The Roman Catholics alſo imagine, that they find a warrant in the ſame text for perſons who do

do not bear the miniſterial character, to adminiſter baptiſm, when a ſuppoſed neceſſity urges; becauſe they conclude, that the Apoſtles were not able to baptize ſo great a number, in ſo ſhort a time *. One very learned, ſagacious, and impartial writer, already quoted, No. 65. frankly acknowledges that the paſſage is far from affording any argument againſt immerſion; to whom I will now add another Pædobaptiſt or two. Bp. TAYLOR expreſſes his opinion concerning the text, as follows: "AQUINAS ſuppoſes the Apoſtles did ſo, [that is, uſed ſprinkling inſtead of immerſion] when the *three thouſand*, and when the *five thouſand*, were at once converted and baptized. But this is but a *conjecture*, and hath no tradition and no record to warrant it †." BOSSUET remarks upon it thus: "It appears not that the *three thouſand* and the *five thouſand*, mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles, who were converted at the firſt ſermons of St. Peter, were baptized any other way [than by immerſion;] and the great numbers of thoſe converts, is no proof that they were baptized by ſprinkling, as ſome have conjectured. For, beſides that nothing obliges us to ſay, that they were all baptized on the *ſame day*; 'tis certain that S. John the Baptiſt, who baptized no leſs numbers, ſeeing all Judea flocked to him, baptized no other way than by dipping: and his example ſhews us, that, to baptize a great number of people, thoſe places were choſen where there was abundance of water. Add to this, that the *baths* and *purifications* of the ancients, rendered this ceremony eaſy and familiar at that time ‡."—People who are but little accuſtomed to

* FORBESII. *Inſtruct. Hiſt. Theolog.* L. X. C. XIII. § 13.

† *Ductor Dubitant.* B. III. Ch. IV. Rule 15. p. 644.

‡ In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſwer to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 175, 176.

to cold bathing, either for amuſement, for medical purpoſes, or with religious views, may wonder how ſuch multitudes ſhould be accommodated, if they were immerſed in water; but when it is conſidered, that this was done at Jeruſalem, where immerſion was quite familiar, and muſt by the very laws of Judaiſm be daily practiſed, not only there, but through all the country, their amazement will ceaſe. For, as Bp. PATRICK obſerves, on Lev. xv. 12. "There are ſo many waſhings preſcribed [in the law of Moſes,] that it is reaſonable to believe, there were not only at *Jeruſalem*, and in all other *cities*, but in every *village* ſeveral *bathing places* contrived for theſe legal purifications, that men might, without much labour, be capable to fulfil theſe precepts."—That *three thouſand*, therefore, ſhould be immerſed at ſuch a place as Jeruſalem, and at a time when, as the ſacred Hiſtorian remarks, the diſciples *had favour with all the people*, Acts ii. 47. even ſuppoſing them all to have been baptized in *one day*, by the twelve Apoſtles and the ſeventy diſciples; is not half ſo ſtrange as various accounts, relating to facts of a ſimilar nature, that we find in the page of hiſtory. For inſtance: Dr. J. G. KING informs us, That "WOLODIMER (a Ruſſian prince)—was baptized by the name of Baſilius,—and it is ſaid, *twenty thouſand* of his ſubjects were baptized the ſame day *." Mr. JOHN FOXE tells us, that AUSTIN, the Monk, "baptized and chriſtened *ten thouſand* Saxons, or Angles, in the weſt river that is called Swale, beſide York, on a Chriſtmas day †." Dr. ROBERTSON reports, "That a ſingle clergyman baptized, in *one day*, above *five thouſand* Mexicans, and did not deſiſt till

* *Rites and Ceremon. of Greek Church in Ruſſia*, p. 4.

† *Acts and Mon.* under A. D. 602. Vol. I. p. 120.

till he was ſo exhauſted by fatigue, that he was unable to lift up his hands*." Nay, SALMERO aſſerts, (with what reaſon the Reader will judge) that FRANCIS XAVIER, among the Indians, baptized *fifteen thouſand* in one day †."—Mr. JOHN WESLEY has given a very fanciful and ludicrous repreſentation indeed, of the adminiſtration of baptiſm by the venerable John. For, ſpeaking of the multitudes who applied to him, he ſays; "It ſeems, therefore, that they ſtood in *ranks* on the edge of the river, and that John paſſing along, before them, *caſt water* on their heads or faces; by which means he might baptize many thouſands in a day ‡." While I wonder at that *fertility* of invention which appears in this Note of the Annotator, I cannot but deteſt the *puerile* and *farcical* turn, which he has given to the conduct of our Lord's harbinger, when adminiſtering a ſolemn ordinance of holy worſhip. If the credit of *ſprinkling* cannot be ſupported without burleſquing the ſacred hiſtory, and expoſing one of the moſt exalted human characters to the ridicule of Infidels in this manner, it ought for ever to ſink in oblivion. But what will not the love of hypotheſis do, when cheriſhed by ſuch an expoſitor!

REFLECT. V. If theſe numerous and learned authors be not under a groſs miſtake, in regard to the apoſtolic practice; my Reader has reaſon to be ſurpriſed, offended, ſhocked, at the following reflection which is caſt on immerſion: becauſe he cannot but perceive it fall on ſome of the moſt venerable and excellent perſons that ever appeared in the world. "To baptize

* *Hiſt. South America*, Vol. II. p. 384. Quarto Edit.

† Apud FORBESII *Inſtruct. Hiſt. Theol.* L. X. C. XIII. § 13.

‡ *Note*, on Matt. iii. 6.

baptize *naked*, or *next* to naked, (which is SUPPOSED, and GENERALLY *practiſed* in immerſion) is againſt the law of modeſty; and to do ſuch a thing in *public ſolemn aſſemblies*, is ſo far from being *tolerable*, that it is *abominable*, to every chaſte ſoul: and eſpecially to baptize *women* in this manner *."—When, peruſing the Treatiſe, I came at theſe words, I pauſed, I was aſtoniſhed, I was almoſt confounded. What, thought I, does the amiable and excellent Mr. HENRY ſay ſo! Immerſion SUPPOSE the ſubject of the ordinance NAKED, or NEXT *to naked!* This PRACTISED, GENERALLY *practiſed, practiſed in* PUBLIC SOLEMN ASSEMBLIES, and that upon WOMEN too! Where have you been, ye ſons of ſenſuality! that you have not crouded around our baptiſteries, when we have immerſed any of the fair ſex? How many fine opportunities have you miſſed, of feaſting your laſcivious eyes and exulting in the wonderful ſight! And what are you about, ye Infidels! ye who laugh at every thing ſacred, and take a malignant pleaſure in expoſing Chriſtianity to ridicule! what, I again aſk, are ye about, that you have not publiſhed our praiſe for gratifying your enmity to the religion of Jeſus Chriſt! for, on the word of an Author who has long been held in a high degree of eſteem by the religious public, we have often committed the moſt enormous outrage, I will not ſay, on the *ſolemnities of religion*, becauſe you do not regard them; but, on *the laws of decorum*, and on the *modeſt feelings* of the tender ſex; even while profeſſing to act by the authority and example of Chriſt. What, are *ye* ſilent, *all* ſilent on ſuch an intereſting occaſion; while the pen of a *Chriſtian Miniſter*, of a *ſacred Expoſitor*,

* Mr. MATT. HENRY's *Treatiſe on Baptiſm*, p. 138, 139.

poſitor, and of a *Proteſtant Diſſenting* BROTHER, is thus officiouſly employed! *This*, ah! this——but I forbear, and ſhall only add, a *ſalutary* prohibition, a *gentle* reprehenſion, and a *candid* extenuation. THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR; is the prohibition of JEHOVAH, the God of Iſrael. "*We ought to* DISOWN *and ſhew a* DISLIKE *of the* PROPHANE SCOFFS *which ſome people give to the Engliſh Antipædobaptiſts, merely for their uſe of* DIPPING;" is the reprehenſion of Dr. WALL, the Epiſcopalian. See No. 82. *I wot that* THROUGH IGNORANCE *ye did it*; is the extenuation of Peter the Apoſtle, when the moſt unjuſtifiable conduct was under his notice.

Thoſe who have read the writings of Dr. FEATLEY, and of Meſſrs. BAXTER, WILLS, RUSSEN, BURKIT, and various others, in vindication of Pædobaptiſm, cannot be ignorant, that the Baptiſts have been frequently treated in the moſt illiberal manner. I will here preſent the Reader with an extract from the famous Mr. BAXTER, and leave the impartial to judge, whether it be the language of calm reaſon, of authenticated fact, and of Chriſtian charity; or the clamour of prejudice, the diſtortion of miſrepreſentation, and the raving of a perſecuting temper. Thus, then, Mr. BAXTER: "My ſixth argument ſhall be againſt the uſual manner of their baptizing, as it is by dipping over head in a river, or other cold water—That which is a plain breach of the ſixth commandment, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, is no ordinance of God, but a moſt heinous ſin. But the ordinary practice of baptizing over head in cold water, as neceſſary, is a plain breach of the ſixth commandment. Therefore it is no ordinance of God, but an heinous ſin. And as Mr. CRADOCK in his book

of

of *Goſpel Liberty* ſhews, the magiſtrate *ought to reſtrain it*, to ſave the lives of his ſubjects—That this is *flat murder*, and no better, being ordinarily and generally uſed, is undeniable to any underſtanding man—And I know not what trick a covetous landlord can find out to get his tenants to die apace, that he may have new fines and heriots, likelier than to encourage ſuch preachers, that he may get them all to turn Anabaptiſts. I wiſh that *this device* be not it that countenanceth theſe men. And covetous phyſicians, methinks, ſhould not be much againſt them. Catarrhs and obſtructions, which are the two great fountains of moſt mortal diſeaſes in man's body, could ſcarce have a more notable means to produce them, where they are not, or to increaſe them where they are. Apoplexies, lethargies, palſies, and all comatous diſeaſes, would be promoted by it. So would cephalalgies, hemicranies, phthiſes, debility of the ſtomach, crudities, and almoſt all fevers, dyſenteries, diarrheas, colics, iliac paſſions, convulſions, ſpaſms, tremors, and ſo on. All hepatic, ſplenetic, pulmoniac perſons, and hypocondriacs, would ſoon have enough of it. In a word it is good for nothing but to *diſpatch* men out of the world that are burthenſome, and to *ranken* church yards—I conclude, if *murder* be a ſin, then dipping ordinarily in cold water overhead, in England, is a ſin: and if thoſe that would make it mens religion to *murder themſelves*, and urge it on their conſciences as their duty, are *not to be ſuffered* in a common wealth, any more than *highway murderers*; then judge how theſe Anabaptiſts, that teach the neceſſity of ſuch dipping, are to be ſuffered—My ſeventh argument is alſo againſt another wickedneſs in their manner of baptizing, which is their dipping perſons *naked*,

naked, as is *very uſual* with many of them; or *next* to naked, as is uſual with the modeſteſt that I have heard of—If the miniſter muſt go into the water with the party,—it will certainly tend to his *death*; though they may ſcape that go in but once—Would not vain young men come to a baptizing to ſee the nakedneſs of maids, and make a mere jeſt and ſport of it *?"

Amara lento temperet riſu, ſays one of the ancients †. Poor man! He ſeems to be afflicted with a violent *hydrophobia!* for he cannot think of any one being immerſed in cold water, but he ſtarts, he is convulſed, he is ready to die with fear. Immerſion, you muſt know, is like Pandora's box, and pregnant with a great part of thoſe diſeaſes which MILTON's angel preſented to the view of our firſt father. A compaſſionate regard, therefore, to the lives of his fellow creatures, compels Mr. BAXTER, to ſolicit the aid of magiſtrates againſt this deſtructive plunging, and to cry out in the ſpirit of an exclamation once heard in the Jewiſh temple; "*Ye men of Iſrael, help!* or Baptiſt miniſters will depopulate your country. Know you not, that theſe plunging teachers are ſhrewdly ſuſpected of being *penſioned*, by avaricious landlords, to deſtroy the lives of your liege ſubjects? Exert your power: apprehend the delinquents: appoint an *Auto da fe*; let the venal dippers be baptized in blood, and thus put a ſalutary ſtop to their peſtiferous practice."—What a pity it is, that the celebrated *Hiſtory of Cold Bathing*, by Sir JOHN FLOYER, had not been publiſhed half a century ſooner! It might, perhaps, have preſerved this good man from a multitude of painful paroxiſms, occaſioned by the thought of immerſion in cold water.—Were I ſeriouſly to put a query on theſe

* *Plain Scripture Proof*, p. 134—137. † HORACE.

theſe aſſertions of Mr. BAXTER, it ſhould be, with a little variation, in the words of David; *What ſhall be given unto thee, or what be done unto thee, thou* FALSE *pen?* Were the temper which dictated the preceding caricatura to receive its juſt reproof, it might be in the language of Michael; *The Lord rebuke thee!*

Before I diſmiſs this extraordinary language of Mr. BAXTER, it is proper to be obſerved, that the charge of *ſhocking indecency*, which he lays with ſuch confidence againſt the Baptiſts of thoſe times, was not ſuffered by them to paſs without animadverſion. No, he was challenged to make it good: it was denied, it was confuted by them.—Whether Mr. HENRY, in the paſſage already remarked, proceeds on the authority of Mr. BAXTER, in regard to that *outrage* on decency with which we are charged, or what induced him to record ſuch things, is not for me to determine: but I cannot forbear wondering, that Mr. ROBINS ſhould *publiſh* the obnoxious ſentence; as it appears from his own declaration*, that he has *very much abridged* the Treatiſe. He hopes, indeed, that very few expreſſions will be found in the work, that are "*offenſive* to ſerious and candid readers of *any* denomination†;" but whether the expreſſions to which I advert be not *juſtly offenſive*; whether the offence given to many of his Brethren, who, I truſt, have ſome degree of candour and ſerioufneſs, be not owing to *his* labours, as the Editor; and whether both candour and ſerioufneſs do not oblige him to imitate the following confeſſion of Mr. BAXTER, I leave to my Reader's judgment. "Upon the review of my arguments, upon the controverſy about Infant baptiſm,

* *Adverti ſement*, p. 7. † *Ut ſupra*, p. 8.

tiſm, ſays the famous Nonconformiſt; I find that I have uſed too many *provoking* words, for which I am *heartily ſorry*, and *deſire pardon* of God and him*," i. e. Mr. TOMBES. See No 52. and CHAP. III. No 4.

REFLECT. VI. If, then, it appear, by the conceſſions, declarations, and reaſonings of ſo many learned Pædobaptiſts themſelves, that the natural and proper idea of the term *baptiſm*, the *deſign* of the inſtitution, and the example of the Apoſtles, are all in favour of immerſion, and all agree with our practice; we do not, we *cannot* want any thing more to juſtify our conduct, either before God or man. This muſt be the caſe, except the united teſtimony of ſuch a cloud of witneſſes, and the reaſons of it, can be confronted with ſuperior evidence. We have, however, a few more teſtimonies and conceſſions to review, relating to this branch of the ſubject.

CHAP. V.

The PRESENT PRACTICE *of the Greek and Oriental Churches, in regard to the Mode of Adminiſtration.*

HASSELQUIST: "The Greeks chriſten their children immediately after their birth, or within a few days, at leaſt; *dipping* them in warm water: and in this reſpect they are much wiſer than their brethren the Ruſſians, who *dip* them into rivers in the coldeſt winter." *Travels*, p. 394.

2. ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA: "The Muſcovite prieſts—*plunge* the child three times over head

* In Mr. CROSBY's *Hiſt. Bap.* Vol. III. Pref. p. 55.

and ears in water." Article, RUSSIA, Vol. IX. p. 6910.

3. VENEMA: "In pronouncing the baptiſmal form of words, the Greeks uſe the third perſon; ſaying, *Let the ſervant of Chriſt be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,* and *immerſe* the whole man in water." *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. VI. p. 660.

4. WITSIUS: "That immerſion may be practiſed in cold countries, without any great danger of health and life, the Muſcovites prove by their own example; who *intirely immerſe* their infants three times in water, not believing that baptiſm can be otherwiſe rightly adminiſtered. Nor do they ever uſe warm water, except for thoſe that are weak or ſickly." *OEcon. Foed.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 13.

5. Sir PAUL RICAUT: "The modern Greek church defines baptiſm to be, *a cleanſing, or taking away, of original ſin, by thrice dipping, or plunging into the water*; the prieſt ſaying at every dipping, *In the name of the Father, Amen; and of the Son, Amen; and of the Holy Ghoſt, Amen.* This thrice dipping, or plunging, into the water, this church holds to be as neceſſary to the *form* of baptiſm, as water to the *matter*." *Preſent ſtate of the Greek Church*, p. 163.

6. Dr. J. G. KING: "The Greek church uniformly practiſes the *trine immerſion*, undoubtedly the moſt primitive manner." *Rites and Cerem. of the Greek Church in Ruſſia*, p. 192.

7. Dr. WALL: "*All* the Chriſtians in Aſia, *all* in Africa, and about one *third part* of Europe, are of the laſt ſort [i. e. practiſe immerſion;] in which third part of Europe, are comprehended the Chriſtians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Raſcia, Walachia, Moldavia, Ruſſia, Nigra, &c. and even the

the Muſcovites, who, if *coldneſs* of the country will excuſe, might plead for a diſpenſation with the moſt reaſon of any." *Hiſt. of Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 477.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. As it appears, from the preceding Chapter, that immerſion was the *general* and almoſt *univerſal* practice, for a long courſe of ages; and, as ſome of thoſe learned authors aſſert, for THIRTEEN CENTURIES; ſo it is manifeſt, from theſe quotations, that it has been uninterruptedly continued as the general mode of proceeding, in all the Greek and Oriental churches. Now theſe churches, as Dr. WALL informs us, comprehend "*very near one half* the Chriſtians in the world." See Chap. XI. No. 6. Nay, Dr. KING tells us, that they have "a *greater* extent than the Latin, with all the branches which are ſprung from it *." Conſequently, though we are far from conſidering the *numbers* that adopt a ſentiment, or a practice, as the criterion of *truth*, or of *right*; yet we may confidently aſſert, that our practice of immerſion, as eſſential to the ordinance, is neither that *novel*, nor yet *ſingular* thing, which many of our opponents are very deſirous of making their neighbours believe it to be. Nor can I forbear to wonder at their inadvertency, when they act in this manner: and, as to the miniſters of our Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment, it requires an uncommon degree of ignorance, of prejudice, of prevarication, or of aſſurance, for any of *them* to treat immerſion as a novel, an indecent, or an unjuſtifiable practice: becauſe the *Rubric* of their Liturgy, *that* Rubric which they

* *Rites and Ceremn. of the Greek Church*, p. 3.

they have *ſolemnly profeſſed* to believe and approve, even that *very* Rubric which they have engaged to treat as the *law* of their proceedings, in the adminiſtration of baptiſm, as well as in other caſes, *expreſſly requires* it; except the ſponſors inform the prieſt, that the child *cannot well bear* dipping. To which the Catechiſm of the ſame Eſtabliſhment plainly adverts, when it inſtructs the catechumen to ſay; "Water, *wherein* the perſon is baptized." For the idea of *pouring*, or *ſprinkling*, cannot be applied here, without rendering the language abſurd.—Agreeable to this, is the former confeſſion of Helvetia, Article XXI. "Baptiſm, according to the inſtitution of the Lord, is the font of regeneration;—in which holy font we do therefore *dip* our infants*." And alſo the confeſſion of Saxony, Article XIII. "Baptiſm is an intire action: to wit, *a dipping*; and the pronouncing of thoſe words, *I baptize thee in the name*, and ſo on*."

REFLECT. II. In reſpect of the *trine* immerſion, practiſed by the Greek Church and the Eaſtern Chriſtians, though it be undoubtedly of great antiquity; and though it appear to have originated in a ſtrong, but miſapplied, regard to that capital article of the Chriſtian creed, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; yet, as there is no intimation in the New Teſtament, that it was either injoined by Chriſt, or practiſed by his Apoſtles, we cannot agree with Dr. KING, when he calls it, "the *moſt primitive* manner." See No. 6. It was, however, practiſed even here, in the time of EDWARD VI. for, by his firſt Common Prayer book, "the miniſter is to dip the child in the water *thrice:* firſt, dipping the right ſide;

* *Harmony of Confeſſions*, p. 397. 404.

ſide; ſecondly, the left; the third time dipping the face toward the font*."

Mr. HENRY, when pleading the cauſe of aſperſion, ſays; "I believe that *immerſion*, yea *trine* immerſion, or plunging the perſon baptized three times, was commonly uſed in very early ages; and that, *as far as* POPERY *prevailed*, a great deal of ſtreſs was laid upon it†." Would this ingenious author, then, perſuade us, that immerſion, whether once, or thrice, originated in *Popery*, and that it was peculiar to ſuch profeſſors of Chriſtianity as acknowledged the Papal authority? If ſo, he labours to poſſeſs his readers of a groſs miſtake. For, as to *immerſion*, it appears, I think, with ſufficient evidence, by quotations already produced from the moſt eminent Pædobaptiſts, that it has the ſanction of divine authority in the apoſtolic practice. And, as to the *trine* immerſion, it is manifeſt from TERTULLIAN, that it was commonly uſed, long before the ſupremacy of the biſhop of Rome was either claimed by himſelf, or acknowledged by others; yet, the term *Popery* ſignifies a ſyſtem of religious principles and practices, in which an acknowledgment of that ſupremacy makes a diſtinguiſhing and capital figure. "By *Popery*, ſays that excellent polemical author, STAPFERUS, we underſtand that religion which conſiders the Pope as the viſible and principal head of the church;—whence alſo it has its *name* ‡." Beſides, it appears that the Greek and Oriental churches, which include about one half the Chriſtian world, have always practiſed immerſion; and that, for a long courſe of ages, the *trine* immerſion has been their general

* *Encyclopædia Britan.* Vol. II. Article, BAPTISM.

† *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 137.

‡ *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Cap. XIV. § 1.

general cuſtom: yet they never acknowledged the Papal power; nor, ſo far as I have obſerved, was their profeſſion of Chriſtianity ever called *Popery*. How unfair, then, is that inſinuation which is contained in theſe words; "As far as *Popery* prevailed!" As if the Papiſts, in former times, had been the only perſons that pleaded for the baptiſmal plunging; and as if our practice had been derived from them! That an author of Mr. HENRY's learning, reading, and character, ſhould inſinuate ſuch things, is amazing! So far from us having derived *immerſion* from Popery, that quite the reverſe is a fact: for learned Pædobaptiſts themſelves have aſſured us, that *pouring* and *ſprinkling*, as a common practice, have an excluſive claim to the honour of ſuch an original. See CHAP. VII. No. 18, 19. and REFLECT. V. of the ſame Chapter.

CHAP. VI.

The Deſign of Baptiſm MORE FULLY EXPRESSED *by Immerſion, than by Pouring, or Sprinkling.*

WITSIUS: "It muſt not be diſſembled, that there is, in *immerſion*, a *greater fruitfulneſs* of ſignification, and a *more perfect correſpondence* between the ſign and the thing ſignified; as we ſhall ſhew, when we come to that part of our ſubject." *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 13.

2. ALSTEDIUS: "The rite of immerſion, which is intimated by the very word *baptiſm*, certainly bears *a greater analogy* to the thing ſignified." *Lexicon Theologicum*, Cap. XII. p. 223.

3. Mr.

3. Mr JOHN ROGERS: "I dare not deny my judgment to teach thus far for *dipping*, above the other forms of ſprinkling or pouring; that were it as orderly in our Church, and uſed, and no offence to weak ſouls, I would ſooner be induced to *dip* one that was never before baptized, than to *ſprinkle* one: for, to me, it would be *more ſignificant*, and *full*, and *pregnant with former practices*." In Mr. CROSBY's *Hiſt. Bap.* Vol. III. Pref. p. 53.

4. HEIDEGGERUS: "Though the rite of immerſion be *more ancient*, and, on account of its more fully repreſenting a death and burial, *more expreſſive*, Rom. vi. 4. yet it appears, from what has been ſaid, that aſperſion makes no alteration in the eſſence and myſtery of baptiſm." *Corpus Theolog. Chriſt.* Loc. XXV. § 35.

5. ESTIUS: "Though the ceremony of immerſion was anciently more common, as appears from the unanimous language of the Fathers, as often as they ſpeak about baptiſm; and in a *more expreſſive* manner repreſents the death, burial, and reſurrection of our Lord, and of us;—whence St. Thomas affirms, that the rite of dipping is *more commendable*; yet there have been many reaſons, for which it was ſometimes convenient, to alter immerſion into ſome other kindred ceremony. Hence, therefore, the ceremony of *pouring*, as *a medium* between dipping and ſprinkling, was much uſed; which cuſtom, BONAVENTURE ſaith, was in his time much obſerved in the French churches and ſome others; though he confeſſes, that the ceremony of immerſion was the *more common*, the *more fit*, and the *more ſafe*, as S. THOMAS teaches." Apud KNATCHBULL. *Animadverſ. in Libr. Nov. Teſt.* p. 181.

6. Dr. CLARKE: "In the primitive times, the manner

manner of baptizing was by *immersion*, or dipping the whole body into the water. And this manner of doing it, was *a very significant* emblem of the dying and rising again referred to by St. Paul," Rom. vi. 4. *Expos. Church Catechis.* p. 294.

7. Mr. W. PERKINS: "A question may be made, whether washing of the body in baptism must be by *dipping*, or by *sprinkling? Answer*; In hot countries, and in the baptism of men of years, dipping was used, and that by the Apostles; and to this Paul alludes, Rom. vi. 3. and dipping doth *more fully represent* our spiritual washing, than sprinkling." *Works*, Vol. II. p. 256.

8. PICTETUS: "It was usual in ancient times for the whole body to be *immersed* in water—and, it must be confessed, that such a rite *most happily* represented that grace by which our sins are, as it were, *drowned*, and we *raised again* from the abyss of sin." *Theolog. Christ.* L. XIV. C. IV. § 17.

9. MASTRICHT: "Immersion—was used by the Apostles and primitive churches, because it is not only *more agreeable* in the warm Eastern countries, but also *more significant*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5." *Theoret. Pract. Theolog.* L. VII. C. IV. § 9.

10. H. ALTINGIUS: After briefly stating the arguments for immersion, and for sprinkling, he adds; "We confess, first, that immersion was the *prior* rite; because it was first used by John the Baptist and the Apostles. Secondly, it is also *more expressive*, on account of the distinct acts, Rom. vi." *Theolog. Problem. Nov.* Loc. XIV. Prob. XI. p. 657.

11. M. MORUS: "Baptism was formerly celebrated by *plunging the whole body* in water, and not by casting *a few drops* of water on the forehead; *that* representing death and the resurrection *much better* than

than *this*." In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſw. to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 149.

12. Dr. CAVE: "The party to be baptized was wholly immerged, or put under water;—whereby they did *more notably* and *ſignificantly* expreſs the three great ends and effects of baptiſm." *Primitive Chriſtianity*, Part I. Chap. X. p. 203.

13. Dr. WALL: "I had the diſadvantage [in defending the common practice] to plead for a way of baptiſm, of which the *beſt* I could ſay, was, That it is ſufficient for the *eſſence* of baptiſm; but *could not* deny the other (except in the caſe of danger of health) to be the *fitteſt*.—The immerſion of the perſon, whether infant or adult, in the poſture of one that is buried and raiſed up again, is *much more ſolemn*, and expreſſes the deſign of the ſacrament and the myſtery of the ſpiritual waſhing *much better*, than pouring a ſmall quantity of water on the face. And that pouring of water, is much better than *ſprinkling*, or dropping a drop of water on it. If it be done in the church, in, or at the font, and the congregation do join in the prayers there uſed; it is much more ſolemn than in a bed-chamber, out of a baſon, or pipkin, a tea-cup, or a punch-bowl; and a bed-chamber is perhaps not quite ſo *ſcandalous* as a kitchen or ſtable, to which things look as if they would bring it at laſt—We have reaſon to give God thanks, that the preſent orders and rubricks of our church are all calculated for the reforming of theſe abuſes, and preſerving the dignity of this holy ſacrament; and that there wants nothing but the due execution of them, and our conſcientious performing of that which we ſolemnly promiſed before God and the biſhop, when we had the charge of ſouls committed to us, that *we would conform to the Liturgy of*

the church of England, as it is now by law established. —I know that some midwives and nurses do, on the christening day, (which they think is observed, not so much for the sacrament itself, as for their shewing their *pride*, *art*, and *finery*) dress the child's head so, that the face of it being hid deep under the lace and trimming which stands up so high on each side, the minister can't come at the face to pour water on it, so as that it may run off again; but what water he pours, will run in among the head-cloths, which really is likely to do the child more hurt than *dipping* would have done." *Defence of Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 404—408.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. From these quotations we learn, That immersion, compared with pouring, or sprinkling, has the honour of *priority*, in respect of time, See No. 4. 10.—That it is more *significant*. See No. 1—13.—That it is more *safe*, or certain of being right. See No. 5.—And that one of these learned authors, who had well studied the subject, felt, by painful experience, the *disadvantage* under which a Pædobaptist labours, and the *arduous* task he has to perform, when he undertakes to defend any mode of administration short of dipping; because the *best* he can say of it is, that the *essence* of baptism is not wanting. See No. 13.

REFLECT. II. I can hardly forbear supposing, that the attentive Reader anticipates my reflections here, and is ready to exclaim: What, practise a mode of administering baptism, that is rejected by one *half* the world; while you cannot but acknowledge, that *antiquity*, *significancy*, and *safety* of being right,

right, may be all fairly pleaded againſt it! Strange, there ſhould be ſuch charms in a religious cuſtom, that is a confeſſed variation from the examples of *Apoſtles*, of *Martyrs*, of Chriſtians *almoſt univerſally* for the long time of thirteen hundred years, and of *ſo great* a part of thoſe who bear the character of Chriſtians at this day! Strange, indeed, that any who are the friends of Chriſt, ſhould *confeſſedly impoveriſh* the ſignificancy of a ſacred rite; and then labour, and ſtrive, and toil, to make it appear that they have not annihilated the *eſſence* of it! A very ſingular conduct this, relating to an ordinance of God, a branch of divine worſhip, and a mean of human happineſs! But is it commendable, is it juſtifiable, is it rational, that the profeſſed followers of Jeſus Chriſt, ſhould ſtudy to find out the exact boundaries of *eſſence*, in a poſitive inſtitution; that they may be able to determine with preciſion, *how far* they may vary from, the natural import of our Lord's *command*, his own *example*, and the *practice* of his Ambaſſadors, without intrenching on what is *eſſential* to the appointment? Let candour, let common ſenſe determine.

How much is the conduct of theſe Authors, like that of the Roman Catholics! The latter, we know, adminiſter the Lord's ſupper to the people in *one* kind; even while they cannot but acknowledge, that Chriſt appointed the uſe of wine, as well as of bread; that the Apoſtles adminiſtered both kinds; that the church for many centuries received the ſacred ſupper in both kinds; and that the repreſentation of our Lord's death is *more complete*, by the adminiſtration of both kinds; yet after all theſe conceſſions pretend, that they do not intrench on the *eſſence* of the ordinance, by adminiſter-

ing

ing the bread only! But, strange as their procedure is, it must have been with an ill grace, that any of the writers here produced, objected against that mutilation of the holy supper.—Besides, the best evidence yet produced, that pouring, or sprinkling, contains the *essence* of baptism; has always been treated, by a very large part of the Christian world, as extremely doubtful. In proof of this assertion, I appeal to the authorities produced, CHAP. IV. and V. and to those which follow, in the next.—Being taught, therefore, by so many respectable Pædobaptists, that the *radical idea* of the term baptism, the *chief design* of the ordinance, the *Apostolic* example, the *present practice of one half* the Christian world, and the *emphasis* of signification, are all in favour of immersion; we must stand acquitted of blame, and our conduct, in regard to dipping, deserve imitation. It cannot be otherwise, except it should hereafter appear, that *substantial* reasons may be assigned, for altering the practice of immersion, to that of pouring, or sprinkling: and substantial they *must be*, to answer so important an end, in the face of all these concessions and all this evidence. It would be the height of precipitancy, and little short of religious madness, to desert an hypothesis thus recommended, for one that appears in *such embarrassment*, without the most cogent reasons. What those reasons are, that have been thought sufficient by many of the most learned Pædobaptists; what their force, and what regard they deserve, must be considered in the following Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning the REASONS, RISE, *and* PREVALENCE *of Pouring, or Sprinkling, inſtead of Immerſion.*

DEYLINGIUS; "So long as the Apoſtles lived, as many believe, *immerſion* ONLY was uſed: to which afterwards, perhaps, they added a kind of *affuſion*, ſuch as the Greeks practiſe at this day, after having performed the trine immerſion. At length, after the Apoſtles were dead, the baptiſm of *Clinics* was known; when, *diſeaſe*, or *extreme neceſſity* in any other reſpect, forbidding immerſion, *ſprinkling* and *pouring* began to be introduced; which, in a courſe of time, were retained, *plunging* being neglected. For, in following times, when adult perſons were very ſeldom baptized, infants were initiated into the Chriſtian church by pouring and ſprinkling." *Obſervat. Sac.* Pars. III. Obſerv. XXVI. § 2. p. 197.

2. SALMASIUS: "The Clinics only, becauſe they were confined to their beds, were baptized in a manner of which they were capable: not in the intire laver, as thoſe who dip the head under water; but the *whole body* had water *poured* upon it. As CYPR. IV. *Epiſt.* VII. Thus NOVATUS, when ſick, received baptiſm; being (περιχυθεις) *beſprinkled*, not (βαπτισθεις) *baptized*. EUSEB. VI. *Hiſt.* Cap. 43." Apud WITSIUM, *OEcon. Foed.* L. IV. C. XVI. § 13.

3. Mr. FORMEY: "Putting off their cloaths they were dipped three times in water;—but when they adminiſtered baptiſm to the *Cliniques*, i. e. to thoſe who were confined to their beds from illneſs, they made uſe only of *ſimple ſprinkling*." *Abridg. Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Vol. I. p. 33.

4. TUR-

4. TURRETTINUS: "*Immerſion* was uſed in former times and in warm climates, as we are taught by the practice of John the Baptiſt, Matt. iii. 6, 16. of Chriſt's Apoſtles, Joh. iii. 22. and iv. 1, 2. and of Philip, Acts viii. 38. But now, eſpecially in *cold countries*, when the church began to extend itſelf towards the North, *plunging* was changed into *ſprinkling*, and aſperſion only is uſed." *Inſtitut.* Tom. III. Loc. XIX. Quaeſt. XI. § 11.

5. Mr. W. PERKINS: "The ancient cuſtom of baptizing, was to *dip*, and, as it were, to *dive all the body* of the baptized in the water, as may appear in Paul, Rom. vi. and the Councils of Laodicea and Neocaeſarea; but now, eſpecially in *cold* countries, the church uſeth only to *ſprinkle* the baptized, by reaſon of childrens weakneſs: for very few of ripe years are now adays baptized. We need not much to marvel at this alteration, ſeeing charity and neceſſity may *diſpenſe* with ceremonies, and *mitigate* in equity the ſharpneſs of them." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 74. Edit. 1608.

6. Dr. MANTON: "You will ſay, If the rite [of immerſion] hath this ſignification, [Chriſt's death for ſin, and our death to ſin] why is it not retained? I anſwer, Chriſtianity lieth not in ceremonies; the principal thing in baptiſm is the waſhing away of ſin, Acts xxii. 16; that may be done by pouring on of water, as well as dipping." *Serm.* on Rom. vi. 4.

7. WALAEUS: "In warm countries, the ancients practiſed an *immerſion of the whole body*;—but, in colder climates, they generally uſed aſperſion: becauſe a ceremony that is free, ought always to give way to charity." *Enchiridium*, de Bap. p. 425.

8. PAMELIUS: "Whereas the ſick, by reaſon of their

their illneſs, could not be *immerſed* or *plunged* (which, properly ſpeaking, is to be *baptized*;) they had the ſalutary water *poured* upon them, or were *ſprinkled* with it. For the ſame reaſon, I think, the cuſtom of ſprinkling that we now uſe, firſt began to be obſerved by the Weſtern church; namely, on account of the *tenderneſs* of infants, ſeeing the baptiſm of adults was now very ſeldom practiſed." Apud FORBESIUM, *Inſtruct. Hiſt. Theolog*, L. X. C. V. § 57.

9. HOORNBEEKIUS: "In the Eaſtern churches baptiſm was more anciently adminiſtered by *immerſing* the body in water. Afterwards, firſt in the Weſtern churches, on account of the *coldneſs* of the countries, *bathing* being leſs in uſe than in the Eaſt, and the *tender age* of thoſe that were baptized, *dipping*, or *ſprinkling*, was admitted." *Miſcell. Sac.* L. I. C. XVII. Sect. IV. § 1.

10. GROTIUS: "The cuſtom of *pouring*, or *ſprinkling*, ſeems to have prevailed in favour of thoſe that were *dangerouſly ill*, and were deſirous of giving up themſelves to Chriſt; whom others called *Clinics*. See the Epiſtle of CYPRIAN to MAGNUS." Apud POLI *Synopſin*, ad Matt. iii. 6.

11. H. ALTINGIUS: "The baptiſmal waſhing, in warm countries and ancient times, was performed by *immerſion*;—but now, eſpecially in *cold* countries, it is performed by only *ſprinkling*.—The *cauſe* of the alteration is, that immerſion, which was uſed in the warm Eaſtern and Southern countries, is leſs convenient in the cold Weſtern and Northern climates: where there is *danger of health* from immerſion, eſpecially of infants. And therefore that rule is here in force; *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*." *Loci Commun.* Pars I. Loc. XII. p. 198, 199. *Theolog. Problem. Nov.* Loc. XIV. Prob. XI. p. 657.

12. KECK-

12. KECKERMANNUS: "Though the term *baptiſm* properly ſignifies *immerſion*, and though alſo in the ancient church, through the Eaſtern countries, when baptiſm was adminiſtered, it was, not by *ſprinkling*, but by *immerſion*; yet in the *colder* parts of Chriſtendom, aſperſion is uſed inſtead of immerſion, on account of infants: becauſe charity and neceſſity may diſpenſe with ceremonies, and temper them with *gentleneſs*, ſo far as may be done without injuring the analogy." *Syſtem. Theolog.* L. III. C. VIII. p. 369.

13. PISCATOR: "Whether the whole body be dipped, and that thrice, or once; or whether water be only poured, or ſprinkled, on the party; this ought to be free to the churches, according to the *difference of countries*." *Aphoriſmi Doct. Chriſtian.* Loc. XXIV. Aph. 9.

14. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "We grant that baptiſm then [in the primitive times] was by waſhing the whole body; and did not the difference of our *cold* country, as to that hot one, teach us to remember, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*, it SHOULD BE SO HERE." *Paraphraſe on the New Teſt.* at Matt. iii. 6.

15. Bp. BURNET: "The danger of dipping in *cold* climates, may be a very good reaſon for changing the form of baptiſm to *ſprinkling*." *Expoſition of* XXXIX. *Articles*, p. 436.

16. VENEMA: "Sprinkling was uſed in the *laſt moments* of life, on ſuch as were called *Clinics*;—and alſo where there was not a *ſufficient quantity* of water." *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Vet. et Nov. Teſt.* Secul. IV. §. 110.

17. Dr. TOWERSON: "The *firſt* mention we find of *aſperſion* in the baptiſm of the elder ſort, was in the caſe

caſe of the *Clinici*, or men who received baptiſm upon their *ſick beds*; and that baptiſm is repreſented by S. CYPRIAN as legitimate, upon the account of the *neceſſity* that compelled it, and the *preſumption* there was of God's gracious acceptation thereof becauſe of it. By which means the *lawfulneſs* of any other baptiſm, than by an *immerſion*, will be found to lie in the *neceſſity* there may ſometimes be of another manner of adminiſtration of it." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 59, 60.

18. Sir JOHN FLOYER: "The church of Rome hath drawn *ſhort compendiums* of both ſacraments. In the Euchariſt, they uſe only the *wafer*,—and, inſtead of immerſion, they introduced *aſperſion*—I have now given what teſtimony I could find in our Engliſh authors, to prove the practice of immerſion from the time the Britons and Saxons were baptized, till king JAMES's days; when the people grew peeviſh with all ancient ceremonies, and through the *love of novelty*, and the *niceneſs of parents*, and the *pretence of modeſty*, they laid aſide immerſion; which never was abrogated by any Canon, but is ſtill recommended by the preſent Rubrick of our Church, which orders the child to be *dipt* diſcreetly and warily." *Hiſt. of Cold Bathing*, p. 15. 61.

19. Dr. WALL: "In the caſe of ſickneſs, weakneſs, haſte, want of quantity of water, or ſuch like extraordinary occaſions, baptiſm by *affuſion* of water on the face, was by the ancients counted ſufficient baptiſm. I ſhall out of the many proofs of it produce two or there of the *moſt ancient*. Anno Dom. 251, NOVATIAN was by one party of the clergy and people of Rome choſen biſhop of that church, in a ſchiſmatical way, and in oppoſition to CORNELIUS, who had been before choſen by the major

major part, and was already ordained. CORNELIUS does in a letter to FABIUS, biſhop of Antioch, vindicate his right: and ſhews that NOVATIAN came not canonically to his orders of prieſthood, much leſs was he capable of being choſen biſhop; for that *all the clergy and a great many of the laity, were againſt his being ordained preſbyter, becauſe it was not lawful* (they ſaid) *for any one that had been baptized in his bed in time of ſickneſs,* [του εν κλινη δια νοσον περιχυθεντα] *as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy*— France ſeems to have been the *firſt country in the world*, where baptiſm by affuſion was uſed ordinarily to perſons in health, and in the public way of adminiſtering it——It being allowed to *weak* children [in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH]—to be baptized by aſperſion; many *fond ladies* and gentlewomen firſt, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favour of the prieſt to have their children paſs for *weak* children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. Eſpecially, as Mr. WALKER obſerves, *if ſome inſtance really were*, or were but *fancied or framed, of ſome child's taking hurt by it*——CALVIN had not only given his dictate in his inſtitutions, that *the difference is of no moment, whether he that is baptized be dipt all over, and if ſo, whether thrice or once*; or *whether he be only wetted by the water poured on him:* but he had alſo drawn up, for the uſe of his church at Geneva, and afterwards publiſhed to the world, *A form of adminiſtering the ſacraments*; where, when he comes to order the act of baptizing, he words it thus: *Then the miniſter of baptiſm* POURS *water on the infant*, ſaying, *I baptize thee*, &c. There had been—ſome ſynods in ſome dioceſſes of France, that had ſpoken of affuſion without mentioning

immerſion

immerſion at all, that being the common practice; but for an *Office* or *Liturgy* of any church, this is, I believe, the FIRST IN THE WORLD that preſcribes aſperſion abſolutely——And for *ſprinkling* properly called, it ſeems it was, at 1645, *juſt then beginning*, and uſed by *very few*. It muſt have began in the diſorderly times *after* 41——But then came *The Directory*,—and ſays; *Baptiſm is to be adminiſtered, not in private places, or privately*;—but in *the place of public worſhip*, and *in the face of the congregation*, &c. *And not in the places where fonts, in the time of Popery, were unfitly and ſuperſtitiouſly placed.* So—they reformed the *font* into a *baſon*. This learned Aſſembly could not remember, that *fonts* to baptize in, had been always uſed by the primitive Chriſtians, long before the beginning of Popery, and ever ſince churches were built: but that *ſprinkling*, for the common uſe of baptizing, was really introduced (in France firſt, and then in other Popiſh countries) *in times of Popery*. And that accordingly, ALL THOSE COUNTRIES IN WHICH THE USURPED POWER OF THE POPE IS, OR HAS FORMERLY BEEN, OWNED, HAVE LEFT OFF DIPPING OF CHILDREN IN THE FONT: BUT THAT ALL OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD, WHICH HAD NEVER REGARDED HIS AUTHORITY, DO STILL USE IT; AND THAT BASONS, EXCEPT IN CASE OF NECESSITY, WERE NEVER USED BY PAPISTS, OR ANY OTHER CHRISTIANS WHATSOEVER, TILL BY THEMSELVES——What has been ſaid of this cuſtom of *pouring* or *ſprinkling* water in the ordinary uſe of baptiſm, is to be underſtood only in reference to theſe *Weſtern* parts of Europe: for it is uſed ordinarily *no where elſe*. The Greek Church, in all the

the branches of it, does ſtill uſe immerſion; and they hardly count a child, except in caſe of ſickneſs, well baptized without it. And ſo do all other Chriſtians in the world, except the Latins. That which I hinted before, is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of; viz, All the nations of Chriſtians, that do *now*, or formerly *did* ſubmit to the authority of the Biſhop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by *pouring*, or *ſprinkling*. And though the Engliſh received not this cuſtom, till after the decay of Popery; yet they have ſince received it from ſuch neighbour nations, as had began it in the time of the Pope's power. *But all other Chriſtians in the world, who never owned the Pope's uſurped power*, DO, AND EVER DID, DIP THEIR INFANTS IN THE ORDINARY USE." *Hiſt. of Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 463, 467, 470, 471, 472, 477.

20. ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA: "The cuſtom of ſprinkling children, inſtead of dipping them in the font, which at firſt was allowed in caſe of the weakneſs or ſickneſs of the infant, has ſo far prevailed, that immerſion is at length quite excluded. What principally tended to confirm the practice of affuſion or ſprinkling, was, that ſeveral of our Proteſtant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of queen MARY, and returning home when queen ELIZABETH came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Proteſtant churches beyond ſea, where they had been ſheltered and received; and having obſerved, that, at Geneva and ſome other places, baptiſm was adminiſtered by ſprinkling, they thought they could not do the church of England a greater piece of ſervice than by introducing a practice dictated by ſo great an oracle as

CALVIN

CALVIN. This, together with the coldneſs of our Northern climate, was what contributed to baniſh entirely the practice of dipping infants in the font." *Article*, BAPTISM, Vol. II. p. 996.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. By the quotations here produced from eminent Pædobaptiſts we are taught; That the *moſt ancient* inſtance, on eccleſiaſtical record, which is yet adduced, of pouring or ſprinkling, is that of NOVATIAN, A. D. 251. See No 19—That the reaſon of it, both then and afterwards, was, not any *real*, nor even *pretended*, command, or example, in the New Teſtament; but a ſuppoſed *neceſſity*, ariſing, either from bodily diſeaſe, a want of water for immerſion, or ſome other ſimilar circumſtance. See No. 1, 2, 3. 7. 8. 10. 16, 17.—That even then, the water was not applied by pouring upon, or ſprinkling, the *face*, but the *whole body*. See No 2.—That it was conſidered as an *imperfect* adminiſtration of the ordinance; ſo imperfect, as rendered the ſubject of it *ineligible* to the miniſterial office, and was denominated *ſprinkling*, not *baptizing*. See No 2. 19.—That pouring, or ſprinkling, as a *common practice*, originated in the *apoſtate Church of Rome*, and that the Proteſtant churches thence derived it. See No 18, 19.—That this mode of proceeding *commenced* among the Engliſh, in the time of Queen ELIZABETH; but, that immerſion was the prevailing practice, till the reign of JAMES I. See No 18, 19.—That the reaſons of this alteration in England were, the *love of novelty*, *niceneſs of parents*, *pretence of modeſty*, and a high regard for the character of CALVIN. See No. 18, 19, 20.

—That

—That CALVIN's form of adminiſtering the ſacraments was probably the *firſt* in the world, that preſcribed pouring abſolutely. See No 19.—That ſprinkling, *ſtrictly* ſo called, did not commence in England, till the year 1645, and was then uſed by *very few*. *Ibid.*—That the Aſſembly of Divines, at Weſtminſter, converted the *font* into a *baſon*; and that baſons, unleſs in caſe of neceſſity, had *never* been uſed by Papiſts, or *any other* Chriſtians whatever, till by the members of that Aſſembly. *Ibid.*—That the reaſons aſſigned, by theſe Proteſtant authors, for this novel mode of proceeding, are, *coldneſs* of climate; See No. 4, 5. 7, 8, 9. 11, 12. 14, 15. *tenderneſs* of infants; See No. 5. 8. Chriſtianity not conſiſting in *ceremonies*; See No. 6. and that ſacred maxim, *God will have mercy and not ſacrifice*; See No. 11, 12.—And, that ALL *the Chriſtians in the world*, who never owned the Pope's uſurped power, *now do*, and *ever did*, dip their children in the common courſe of their practice. See No. 19. Such is the information which theſe learned authors give.

REFLECT. II. According to this repreſentation, the practice of pouring and ſprinkling makes but a poor figure, in the eyes of a conſiſtent Proteſtant: for, if this be a juſt account, it had no exiſtence till many corruptions had taken deep root in the church; it originated in dangerous error; was foſtered by the Mother of abominations, and under the powerful influence of her authority and her example, it became the general cuſtom in all thoſe parts of the world to which her tyranny ever extended; BUT NO WHERE ELSE. See No. 19. It ſeems to have been under the combined operation of different errors, that the practice took its riſe. For though, as Mr.

Mr. HENRY juſtly obſerves, "many in the primitive times, upon a miſtaken apprehenſion of the *unpardonableneſs* of ſin committed after baptiſm, deferred it long; ſome even till the dying moment*:" yet they imagined the ordinance neceſſary to their ſalvation. When, therefore, they were ſeized with affliction, confined to their beds, and apprehenſive of death; the expedient of pouring, or ſprinkling, was deviſed, in the preſſing emergency, as a happy ſuccedaneum for immerſion. That laborious and learned inquirer Dr. WALL, could find no inſtance of the kind, prior to the caſe of NOVATIAN; which caſe is thus deſcribed in EUSEBIUS. "He fell into a grievous diſtemper, and it being ſuppoſed that he would die immediately, he received baptiſm, being *beſprinkled* with water *on the bed* whereon he lay, if *that* can be termed baptiſm †." On which paſſage VALESIUS obſerves, "This word, περιχυθεις, RUFINUS very well renders *perfuſus*, *beſprinkled*. For people which were ſick and baptized in their beds, could not be *dipped* in water by the prieſt, but were ſprinkled with water by him. This baptiſm was thought *imperfect*, and not *ſolemn* for ſeveral reaſons. Alſo they who were thus baptized, were called ever afterwards, CLINICI; and, by the twelfth canon of the Council of Neocaeſarea, theſe Clinici were prohibited prieſthood." Yea, ſo imperfect was this baptiſm eſteemed, that Bp. TAYLOR tells us; "It was a formal and ſolemn queſtion, made by MAGNUS to CYPRIAN, Whether they are to be eſteemed *right Chriſtians*, who were only *ſprinkled* with water, and not waſhed or dipped? He [Cyprian] anſwers, that baptiſm was good, when it was done

* *Treatiſe on Baptiſm*, p. 27.

† *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* B. VI. Chap. 43. Cambridge, 1683.

done in the caſe of *neceſſity*; God *pardoning*, and *neceſſity compelling*. And this, adds the Biſhop, is the *ſenſe* and *law* of the Church of England: not that it be *indifferent*, but that *all* infants be dipped, except in caſe of ſickneſs, and then ſprinkling is permitted*." —Now that this Clinic baptiſm had no exiſtence in the apoſtolic times, we are led to conclude, not only by conſidering the erroneous foundation on which it reſts, and the total ſilence of the New Teſtament concerning it; but alſo by the teſtimony of ſome very learned Pædobaptiſts. Witneſs ALTMANNUS, who ſays, "It has not yet been proved, that the baptiſm of Clinics was uſed in the time of the Apoſtles; nor, certainly, can any paſſages be produced from the apoſtolic writings, nor from thoſe of the firſt Fathers, from which it may be concluded that it is a rite of ſuch great antiquity †." See CHAP. IV. No. 67.

It is worthy to be remarked, that a groſs miſtake about the neceſſity of baptiſm, not only introduced *ſprinkling*, inſtead of immerſion; but, in ſome inſtances, has operated ſo far as intirely to *exclude water* from any concern in the ordinance. The following examples have occurred to obſervation, in the courſe of my reading.—NICEPHORUS informs us, that a certain Jew, performing a journey in company with Chriſtians, and being ſuddenly ſeized with a dangerous illneſs, earneſtly deſired baptiſm at the hands of his fellow travellers. They, not having a prieſt in their company, and being deſtitute of water, were at firſt reluctant: but he conjuring them not to deny him the favour, they yielded to his requeſt. On which, taking off his cloaths, they ſprinkled him thrice with *ſand*, inſtead of water; adding, that they *baptize*

* *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. III. Chap. IV. Rule 15. p. 64

† *Meletem. Philolog. Critic.* Tom. III. p. 131.

baptized him, in the name of the Father, and ſo on *. —DEYLINGIUS furniſhes another example of a ſingular kind. He tells us, that, near the beginning of the Reformation, a certain midwife, in Upper Saxony, under the fair pretext of neceſſity, baptized ſome ſickly children *without* water, merely by pronouncing theſe words; *I baptize thee in the name*, and ſo on. The ſame learned author, from SECKENDORF, mentions others who taught, that baptiſm might be adminiſtered *without* water †.—TO BAPTIZE, by ſprinkling a *few drops* of water; to BAPTIZE, by ſprinkling of *ſand*, without any water; to BAPTIZE, by merely pronouncing a *form of words*; what miſnomers they are! and what an improvement on the inſtitution of Chriſt!—Our Brethren, who practiſe Free Communion, frequently plead, that thoſe perſons whoſe claim to the holy ſupper is under diſpute, conſider themſelves as *really* baptized, and on *that* ground ſhould be admitted to the Lord's table. Query, Would they receive a candidate for communion, who ſincerely believes he has been baptized, merely becauſe he was ſprinkled with *ſand*, as in the caſe of this Jew; or on account of ſome zealous midwife having pronounced over him a *ſolemn form of words*?

REFLECT. III. The reaſons aſſigned, by theſe Pædobaptiſts, for pouring or ſprinkling, may be compared with the *arguments* of Roman Catholics, in defence of witholding the cup form the people; with the *anſwers* returned by the Proteſtants to their futile reaſonings; and theſe, with the *replies* that Baptiſts make, to the reaſonings in favour of ſprinkling. Do the Roman Catholics argue, That

* Apud *Centur. Magdeburg.* Cent. II. C. VI. p. 82.

† *De Prudentia Paſtoral.* Pars III. C. III. § 20.

the *whole eſſence* of the Lord's ſupper is contained in one kind? So do Proteſtant Pædobaptiſts, that the intire eſſence of baptiſm is retained in pouring or ſprinkling.—Do the *former* maintain, that they who have the thing *ſignified*, need not contend about the *ſign?* So do many of the *latter*.—Do the votaries of Rome tell us, there is no *ſpiritual benefit* enjoyed by receiving both bread and wine, which is not poſſeſſed by thoſe who partake only of the bread? So do our Proteſtant Brethren argue, in reference to pouring and ſprinkling, compared with immerſion.—Do the ſubjects of the triple crown endeavour to perſuade the Reformed, that there were various *types* and *figures* of the holy ſupper, in the Old Teſtament, which favour the receiving it in one kind? Do they plead, for this end, the *paſchal lamb*, the *manna*, the *ſhew-bread*, and the *ſacrifices*, the fleſh of which was to be eaten, but their blood was not to be drank? So Pædobaptiſts endeavour to perſuade us, that ſome *typical rites*, and that various *alluſive expreſſions* in the Old Teſtament (ſuch as, *I will* pour *water on him that is thirſty—He ſhall* ſprinkle *many nations**; with others of a ſimilar kind,) are in favour of ſprinkling.——Have Proteſtants united in replying to the *firſt* of theſe arguments; It is *not a fact*, that the whole eſſence of the Lord's ſupper *is* contained in the ſpecies of bread? So do we aſſert, that the intire eſſence of baptiſm is not retained, in pouring, or ſprinkling: becauſe immerſion of *the whole body*, is as really a diſtinct act from applying a few drops of water to *the face* only, as eating bread is diſtinct from the drinking of wine.—Do the Reformed anſwer to the *ſecond*; This is the ready way to *caſt off* all ſacraments

* Mr. HENRY's *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 140.

craments and ordinances at once? So do we: for if the diſciples of Chriſt may adminiſter baptiſm in either of the different ways, on account of their having the bleſſings to which it refers; they are at liberty, for the ſame reaſon, to neglect, or uſe, any ordinance juſt as they pleaſe.—Do the oppoſers of Papal corruptions reply to the *third*; That, ſuppoſing an equal degree of *benefit*, reſulting from each mode of adminiſtration; yet there *is* not, there *cannot* be, the ſame degree of *humble obedience* to Jeſus Chriſt, who appointed the ſacred ſupper? So do we, in regard to the different ways of adminiſtering baptiſm.—Do the friends of the Proteſtant cauſe agree, in reſpect to the *fourth* argument; That none of the things mentioned, were types or figures of the *Lord's ſupper*; and therefore the analogical reaſoning has *no force at all?* So we maintain, that none of the purifications practiſed in the ancient Jewiſh church (whether by dipping, waſhing, or ſprinkling) were types, or figures, of *baptiſm*. Beſides, we have the authority of a very learned and famous Pædobaptiſt, when we aſſert; That among all the various rites of purification preſcribed to the choſen tribes, "the ſprinkling of *mere water* was not appointed; for it was either mixed with *blood*, or *aſhes**." Conſequently, no alluſion to any of thoſe ancient rites, whether it be found in the Old, or in the New Teſtament; can be a proper direction for us, in the adminiſtration of baptiſm. See CHAP. I.

Again: When Proteſtant writers oppoſe that mutilation of a divine appointment, which is practiſed by thoſe of the Romiſh communion at the Lord's

* LAMPE, *Comment. in Evang. Joan.* ad Cap. III. 5. Tom. I. p. 565, 566.

Lord's table; they do not fail to ſhew, That the *declared will* of God, is the rule of duty; and, that the *inſtitution* of the ordinance, the *example* of the Apoſtles, the *end* of the appointment, and the *practice* of the church for thirteen hundred years, are all againſt that *partial* adminiſtration, and all in favour of the Reformed*. Now are not theſe the *very principles* on which the Baptiſts proceed, in all their diſputes with Pædobaptiſts about the right manner of performimg baptiſm? Nay, does it not appear from the preceding Chapters, and from the pens of our opponents themſelves, that theſe principles are *juſt*, and ſupported by *facts*, relating to the controverſy about *baptiſm*, as well as to that concerning the holy ſupper?

Further: Do ſome of the learned Catholics *acknowledge*, that receiving the Lord's ſupper in both kinds, is more *complete* and more *expreſſive*; and that the preſent practice of their church, is *a departure* from the inſtitution, from apoſtolic example, and from the general cuſtom of Chriſtians for many ages? Do certain of their learned writers expreſs an ardent wiſh to have the primitive practice *reſtored* among them †? All this, it appears, have ſome of our learned oppoſers done, in regard to the adminiſtration of baptiſm. How far the following reflection, upon a conceſſion of CASSANDER, concerning communion in one kind, may be fairly applied to any of the Pædobaptiſts, I leave the Reader to judge. "Behold, ſays my author, behold

* See *Morning Exerciſe ag. Popery*, Serm. XXII. Dr. WILLET's *Synopſ. Papiſmi*, Controv. XIII. Q. VIII. p. 640—647. and Mr. ED. LEIGH's *Bod. Div.* B. VIII. Chap. IX.

† Dr. WILLET, *ut ſupra*, p. 642. and *Morning Exer. ag. Pop.* p. 772.

behold here an acknowledgment ſo plain and ſo full, that I wonder with what countenance men can reſiſt ſo manifeſt a truth, and withhold it in unrighteouſneſs! And yet here they muſter up the beſt ſtrength they have, and will not yield an inch of what they have once eſtabliſhed, be it right or wrong*."

Once more: Do not Proteſtant Pædobaptiſts urge the *neceſſity* of adhering, *ſtrictly* adhering, to the original inſtitution, in adminiſtering the holy ſupper; the *abſurdity* and *iniquity* of departing from it, on account of any ſuppoſed inconveniency; and the *danger* of practiſing any thing in religious worſhip that is not warranted by the word of God? Hear a ſpecimen of what they ſay, and ſee whither the reaſoning tends: for it proceeds on principles that are common to every poſitive inſtitution of true religion.—Thus Dr. CLARKE expreſſes his mind: "In things of *external* appointment, and mere *poſitive* inſtitution, where we cannot, as in matters of natural and moral duty, argue concerning the natural reaſon and ground of the obligation, and the original neceſſity of the thing itſelf; *we have nothing to do but to obey the poſitive command.* God is infinitely better able than we, to judge of the *propriety* and *uſefulneſs* of the things he inſtitutes; and it becomes us to obey with humility and reverence †."—"The command of Chriſt, ſays the judicious TURRETTINE, ought not to be violated under *any pretence whatever*; and in what way ſoever the *thing ſignified* may be received, the *ſign appointed* by Chriſt is always to be retained ‡."—"There is in the church, ſays the learned HEIDEGGER,

* *Morning Exer.* ibid.

† *Expoſ. Church Cat.* p. 305, 306.

‡ *Inſtitut.* Tom. III. Loc. XIX. Quaeſt. XXV. § 22.

DEGGER, no more power of changing the rites of the ſacraments appointed by Chriſt, than there is power of changing his *word* and *law*. For as his word contains a ſign audible, ſo thoſe rites contain a *viſible ſign* of his divine will*."—" There being, in this whole inſtitution, the greateſt ſimplicity and unity of deſign that can be, ſays Bp. TAYLOR; the ſame form of words, a ſingle ſacrament, the ſame addreſs, no difference in the ſanction, no variety, or ſigns of variety, in the appendages, in the parallel places, or in any diſcourſe concerning it; to ſuppoſe here a difference will ſo intricate the whole affair, that either men may imagine and dream of variety when they pleaſe, and be or not be obliged as they liſt; or elſe if there be a difference intended in it by our Lawgiver, it will be as good as none at all. He having left no mark of the diſtinction, no ſhadow of different commandments, under ſeveral repreſentations†."—" All reaſoning upon this head, ſays Bp. BURNET, is an arguing *againſt the inſtitution*; as if Chriſt and his Apoſtles had not well enough conſidered it, but that twelve hundred years after them, a *conſequence* ſhould be obſerved, that till then had not been thought of, which made it reaſonable to alter the manner of it—He who inſtituted it, knew beſt what was moſt fitting and moſt reaſonable; and we muſt chooſe rather to acquieſce in his commands, than in our own reaſonings‡."—" The inſtitution, with the elements, makes the ſacrament; and ſo the only rule and balance for them [the elements] muſt

* *Hiſt. Theolog. Concil. Trident.* p. 2. in Dr. DU VEIL, on Acts viii. 38.

† *Ductor Dubitant.* B. III. Chap. VI. p. 412.

‡ *Expoſ.* XXXIX Art. p. 436, 437.

muſt needs be their inſtitution. This being the ground of this ordinance, [the holy ſupper] no man or angel may violate under a fearful curſe. And, indeed, if men's will or wiſdom might *alter* and *change* the revelation of God; nothing would abide firm in religion. 'Tis true, the laws of men may be corrected and annulled, becauſe they foreſee not their inconveniencies; but our Saviour, certainly, when he appointed this ordinance, well knew what was neceſſary and uſeful for his church to the end of the world. And for this reaſon the Apoſtle Paul, when ſome diſorders were broken into the church of Corinth, in the uſe of the Lord's ſupper; he recalls them to the inſtitution, and endeavours by that ſtraight rule to rectify their irregularities, 1 Cor. xi. 23. By which place it is evident, that there is no ſuch way to obviate any miſtake, which in after-times creeps upon God's own ordinance, as by going back to the ſpring, by conſidering the inſtitution: inſomuch as the ſame Apoſtle, for their violating Chriſt's inſtitution in their adminiſtration of this ordinance, ſaith, 1 Cor. xi. 20. *This is* NOT *to eat the Lord's ſupper**."—Dr. ERSKINE, when anſwering an objection againſt frequently receiving the ſacred ſupper, ſays; "Whatever danger there is, God foreſaw it, but yet did not ſee meet to guard againſt it, by enjoining us to communicate ſeldom. Shall we then pretend to be wiſer than God? Have we found out better means for ſecuring the honour of his inſtitutions, than the means preſcribed and practiſed by thoſe who were under the infallible guidance of his Spirit? Have not attempts of this kind proved the ſource of the *worſt corruptions* in Popery? Reaſon has no power to diſpenſe

* *Morning Exerciſe againſt Popery*, Serm. XXII. p. 764, 765.

diſpenſe with, or to derogate from the poſitive laws of God, on pretence of doing them a ſervice. It is *blaſphemous preſumption*, though it may put on a cloak of humility, to judge that a ſufficient reaſon to hinder thee from frequent communicating, which our Lord did not judge a ſufficient reaſon to hinder him from commanding it. If thou thus judge the law, *thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge**."—Once more: The Church of England ſays, "Before all other things, this we muſt be ſure of eſpecially, that this ſupper be in ſuch wiſe done and miniſtered, as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his holy Apoſtles uſed it, and the good Fathers in the primitive church frequented it. For, as that worthy man S. AMBROSE ſaith, *He is unworthy of the Lord, that otherwiſe doth celebrate that myſtery, than it was delivered by him.* Neither can he be devout, that otherwiſe doth preſume than it was given by the Author†." Quotations of this kind might be greatly multiplied; but I forbear, and appeal to the Reader, Whether theſe be not the *very principles* on which we proceed; nay, whether theſe be not ſome of thoſe *very arguments*, mutatis mutandis, that are uſed by us, againſt *pouring* and *ſprinkling?* If, then, this way of arguing be valid, from the pens of Proteſtants, againſt a mutilation of the holy ſupper; it muſt be equally ſo from the pen of a Baptiſt, in relation to the ſubſtitution of pouring, or ſprinkling, inſtead of immerſion. For, if theſe arguments have any force, they will equally apply to every poſitive inſtitution, that is not adminiſtered according to its original form.

Nor are the Roman Catholics inſenſible of that advantage which Pædobaptiſt Proteſtants give them, in

* *Theolog. Differt.* p. 289.

† *Homily on the Sacram.* Part. I.

in regard to this affair; for thus BOSSUET, a Popiſh prelate, reaſons: "Though theſe are inconteſtible truths, [namely, that baptiſm is *immmerſion*, and that immerſion was practiſed by the Apoſtles] yet neither we, nor thoſe of the pretended Reformed religion, hearken to the Anabaptiſts, who hold merſion to be eſſential and indiſpenſable; nor have either they or we feared to change this dipping, as I may ſay of the whole body, into a bare aſperſion, or infuſion on one part of it. No other reaſon of this alteration can be rendered, than that this dipping is not of the *ſubſtance* of baptiſm; and thoſe of the pretended Reformed religion agreeing with us in this, the firſt principle we have laid down is inconteſtible. The ſecond principle is, That to diſtinguiſh in a ſacrament what does or does not belong to the ſubſtance of it, we muſt conſider the *eſſential efficacy* of the ſacrament. Thus, although the word of Jeſus Chriſt, *baptize*, as has been ſaid, ſignifies *dip*; it has been thought, that the *efficacy* of the ſacrament was not annexed to the *quantity* of water*; ſo that baptiſm by infuſion, and ſprinkling, or by merſion, appearing in reality to have the ſame efficacy, both the one and the other mode is judged good. Now ſeeing, as we have ſaid, we cannot find in the euchariſt any eſſential efficacy of the body, diſtinguiſhed from that of the blood; the

* So ſays Mr. HENRY: "In ſacraments, it is the *truth*, and not the *quantity*, of the outward element, that is to be inſiſted upon." Here, he inadvertently coincides with BOSSUET. In another place, however, he ſays; "*Strict conformity* to the Scripture rule, without the ſuperadded inventions of men, is the *true beauty* of Chriſtian ordinances." This is the language of a ſound Proteſtant, and worthy of himſelf. See his *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 139. 149.

grace of the one and of the other, as to the ſum and ſubſtance of it, cannot but be the ſame. It ſignifies nothing to ſay, The repreſentation of the death of our Lord, *is more expreſs in the two kinds.* I grant it: and in like manner the new birth of a believer, is *more expreſs in immerſion*, than in bare infuſion, or aſperſion. For the believer being plunged in the water of baptiſm, is *buried with Jeſus Chriſt*, as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. and coming out of the water, quits the tomb with his Saviour, and more perfectly repreſents the myſtery of Jeſus Chriſt, who regenerates him. Merſion, in which water is applied to the whole body and to all its parts, alſo more perfectly ſignifies, that a man is more fully and entirely waſhed from his defilements: and yet baptiſm performed by immerſion, or plunging, is not better than that which is adminiſtered by ſimple infuſion, and on one part only. 'Tis ſufficient that the expreſſion of the myſtery of Jeſus Chriſt, and the efficacy of grace, is found in *ſubſtance* in the ſacrament, and the utmoſt exactneſs of repreſentation is not required in it. Thus in the euchariſt the expreſſion of the death of our Lord, being in *ſubſtance* found in it, when that body which was delivered up for us, is given to us; and the expreſſion of the grace of the ſacrament being alſo found in it, when the image of our ſpiritual nouriſhment is given us, under the ſpecies of bread; the blood, which only adds to it a *more expreſs* ſignification, is not abſolutely neceſſary *."

Our Engliſh Epiſcopalians alſo, do not fail to argue on the ſame topic, when defending their hierarchy, and various rites, againſt the objections of Pædobaptiſt Diſſenters. Thus, for example, Bp. BURNET,

* In Mr. STENNETT, *againſt* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 176 - 178.

NET, after having mentioned ſeveral things which he thought for his purpoſe, proceeds: "To theſe inſtances another may be added, that *muſt needs preſs* all that differ from us, one body only excepted, *very much*. We know that the firſt ritual of baptiſm, was by going *into* the waters, and being *laid as dead* all-along in them; and then the perſons baptized *were raiſed up* again, and ſo they came out of them. This is not only mentioned by St. Paul, but in two different places he gives a myſtical ſignification of this rite; that it ſignified our being *buried with Chriſt in baptiſm*, and our being *raiſed up with him to a new life*; ſo that the phraſes, of *riſing with Chriſt*, and of *putting on Chriſt*, as oft as they occur, do plainly relate to this: and yet, partly out of *modeſty*, partly, in regard to the *tenderneſs* of infants, and the *coldneſs* of theſe climates, ſince ſuch a manner might endanger their lives, and we know that God *loves mercy better than ſacrifice*, this form of baptizing is as little uſed by thoſe [Pædobaptiſts] who ſeparate from us, as by ourſelves—From all theſe things this inference ſeems juſt, That according to the practices of thoſe who divide from us, the church muſt be ſuppoſed to have an authority *to adjuſt the forms* of our religion, in thoſe parts of them that are merely ritual, to the *taſte*, to the *exigencies* and *conveniencies* of the ſeveral ages and climates *."—The right reverend prelate here ſpeaks out—He talks like one who heartily believes, that "the church has power to decree rites and ceremonies." This will do almoſt as well, ſo far as the ritual part of religion is concerned, as the claim of infallibility, of a diſ-

* *Four diſcourſes to the Clergy*, p. 281, 282. Compare this with what he ſays, *Expoſit. of* XXXIX. *Art.* p. 436, 437, as quoted before, p. 150.

a diſpenſing power, and the pretence of unwritten apoſtolic tradition, which are advanced by the partiſans of another communion. Such, however, is the Biſhop's avowal; and ſuch he inſiſts upon it, is the *implicit* language of thoſe Diſſenters who practiſe pouring, or ſprinkling, inſtead of immerſion. What a pity it is but the church, under the ancient Jewiſh OEconomy, had been acquainted with this doctrine of *taſte*, of *exigence*, and of *convenience*, relating to the ceremonial part of divine worſhip! What a pity but the hoary Abraham had well underſtood it, when he received an order to *circumciſe* himſelf and his male poſterity! for, had he known and approved of it, he would certainly have performed the rite on a different part from that which Jehovah ſpecified. What ſhall I ſay? this doctrine of *taſte*, of *exigence*, and of *convenience*, is of ſuch an extenſive application, that it would have ſaved the venerable ancients a world of trouble, and ſcreened them from a thouſand reproaches of their Gentile neighbours, had it been duly improved: becauſe, as *God is in one mind*, it cannot be doubted, but *he loved mercy better than ſacrifice* in thoſe early times, as well as now.—But let us hear another learned Epiſcopalian on the ſame ſubject. Thus, then, Dr. WHITBY: "If, notwithſtanding the evidence produced, that baptiſm by immerſion is ſuitable both to the inſtitution of our Lord and his Apoſtles; and was by them ordained to repreſent our *burial* with Chriſt, and ſo our *dying* unto ſin, and our *conformity* to his reſurrection, by newneſs of life, as the Apoſtle doth clearly maintain the meaning of this rite: I ſay, if notwithſtanding this, all our [Pædobaptiſt] Diſſenters do agree to *ſprinkle* the baptized infant; why may they not as well ſubmit to the ſignificant ceremonies

monies impoſed by our church? For, ſince it is as lawful to *add* unto Chriſt's inſtitutions a ſignificant ceremony, as to *diminiſh* a ſignificant ceremony which He or his Apoſtles inſtituted, and uſe another in its ſtead, which they *never did* inſtitute; what reaſon can they have to do the *latter*, and yet refuſe ſubmiſſion to the *former?* And why ſhould not the *peace* and *union* of the church be as prevailing with them to perform the one, as is their *mercy* to the infant's body to neglect the other*?"—Hence the Reader may plainly perceive, how much the practice of aſperſion is calculated to embarraſs *Proteſtants*, in their diſputes with Papiſts; and *Nonconformiſts*, in their controverſies with Epiſcopalians.

REFLECT. IV. Whether in theſe colder climates, and in common caſes, there be any reaſon to conſider *health* as endangered by the practice of immerſion, let Pædobaptiſts themſelves declare. That learned phyſician, Sir JOHN FLOYER, gives his opinion on the ſubject without reſerve, both in a theological and medical point of light. Among many other things, he ſays: "I do here appeal to you, [the Dean and Canons, Reſidentiaries of the cathedral church of Litchfield] as perſons well verſed in the ancient hiſtory, and canons, and ceremonies of the church of England; and therefore are ſufficient witneſſes of the matter of fact which I deſign to prove; viz, That immerſion continued in the church of England till about the year 1600. And from hence I ſhall infer, That if God and the church thought that practice innocent for ſixteen hundred years, it muſt be accounted an *unreaſonable nicety* in this preſent age, to ſcruple either immerſion or cold bathing, as

* *Proteſtant Reconciler*, p. 289. See alſo Bp. STILLINGFLEET's *Irenicum*, Part II. p. 345.

as dangerous practices. Had any prejudice uſually happened to infants by the trine immerſion, that cuſtom could not have continued ſo long in this kingdom. We muſt always acknowledge, that He, that made our bodies, would never command any practice prejudicial to our healths; but, on the contrary, he beſt knows what will be moſt for the preſervation of our healths, and does frequently take great care both of our bodies and ſouls, in the ſame command *."—This eminent phyſician endeavours to ſhew, as Dr. WALL obſerves, "by reaſons taken from the nature of our bodies, from the rules of medicine, from modern experiences, and from ancient hiſtory, that waſhing or dipping infants in cold water is, generally ſpeaking, not only *ſafe*, but *very uſeful:* and that, though no ſuch rite as baptiſm had been inſtituted, yet reaſon and experience would have directed people to uſe cold bathing, both of themſelves and their children: and that it has in all former ages ſo directed them. For—he ſhews, that all civilized nations, the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, &c. made frequent uſe of it, and gave great commendations of it: and that nature itſelf has taught this cuſtom to many barbarous nations; the old Germans, Highlanders, Iriſh, Japaneſe, Tartars, and even the Samoieds, who live in the coldeſt climate that is inhabited—He prognoſticates that the old modes in phyſic and religion will in time prevail, when people have had more experience in cold baths; and that the approbation of phyſicians would bring in the old uſe of immerſion in baptiſm †."—With the opinion of Sir John FLOYER, that of Dr. CHEYNE perfectly coincides. "I cannot, ſays he, forbear recommending

* *Hiſt. of Cold Bathing*, p. 11. 51.

† *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 476, 477.

commending cold bathing. And I cannot ſufficiently admire, how it ſhould ever have come into ſuch diſuſe, eſpecially among Chriſtians; when commanded by the greateſt lawgiver that ever was, under the direction of God's Holy Spirit, to his choſen people, and perpetuated to us in the *immerſion at baptiſm* by the ſame Spirit; who with infinite wiſdom, in this, as in every thing elſe that regards the temporal and eternal felicity of his creatures, combines their duty with their happineſs *."—To the declared opinion of theſe medical authors, relating to the ſalutary tendency of cold bathing, we may add the ſuffrage of that great philoſopher, Lord BACON, who expreſſes himſelf thus: "It is ſtrange that the uſe of *bathing*, as a part of diet, is left. With the Romans and Græcians it was as uſual as eating or ſleeping; and ſo it is amongſt the Turks at this day †." See CHAP. V. No. 2. 5.

But ſuppoſing there were both difficulty and danger, attending the performance of our Lord's poſitive commands, Pædobaptiſts would ſtill aſſure us, that we muſt ſubmit without repining, and without heſitation. Fully to our purpoſe are the words of Mr. CHARNOCK. "They muſt be evaſions paſt underſtanding, that can hold water againſt a divine order—God never gave power to any man to *change* his ordinances, or to *diſpenſe* with them ‡."—"Surely it is enough to know, ſays Abp. SECKER, that He is Lord and King of the whole earth, and that all his dealings with the works of his hands are juſt and reaſonable. Our buſineſs is to *obey*, and truſt him with the conſequences."

* *Eſſay on Health*, p. 100, 101. in *Supplem. to Serm. at Salter's Hall, againſt Pop.* p. 45, 46.

† In Dr. STENNETT'S *Anſw. to* Mr. ADDINGTON, Part I. p. 34.

‡ *Works*, Vol. II. p. 763. 773, 774. Edit. firſt.

quences *."—" Surely, ſays Mr. TOWGOOD, the ſupreme Biſhop and only Head of his church, well knew what inſtitutions were moſt for its edification, and what *ceremonies* and *rites* would beſt promote the order and decency of its worſhip; and either by himſelf, or by his inſpired Apoſtles, has left a *perfect* plan of both. For any weak uninſpired men therefore to riſe up in after ages, and fancy they can *improve* the ſcheme of worſhip which Chriſt hath left; that they can add greatly to its beauty, its ſplendour and perfection by ſome ceremonies of their own, is, to be ſure, *a rude invaſion* of Chriſt's throne, which every ſober Chriſtian ought highly to deteſt †."—Remarkable, and quite in point, is the declaration of Dr. OWEN. " That divine Revelation is the *only* foundation, the *only* law, and the *only* rule of all religious worſhip that is pleaſing to God, or accepted by him, is a maxim of the laſt importance in divinity—This maxim teaches, that every thing appointed by God in his worſhip, however *abſurd*, or *difficult*, or *unprofitable*, it may ſeem to reaſon; is to be regarded and performed with the *deepeſt* reverence and ſubmiſſion, on account of that ſupreme authority which appointed and required it ‡."

Mr. HENRY has juſtly obſerved, that circumciſion was " a *painful* and *bloody* rite §." So the wife of Moſes conſidered it; but yet Abraham and his poſtery were bound to obſerve it, on the peril of Jehovah's keen diſpleaſure. Concerning that ſanguinary ceremony, Pædobaptiſts have ſpoken their minds very freely. M. SAURIN, for inſtance, tells us; " The command of circumciſion did, without doubt, *frighten*

* *Lectures on the Catechiſm*, Lect. II.
† *Diſſent. Gent. Letters, Lett.* III. p. 10, 11. Dublin.
‡ *Theologoumena*, L. IV. C. III. Digreſs. III. p. 326.
§ *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 12.

frighten thoſe who firſt received it; it was dangerous to grown perſons in hot countries: but for an old man to receive the token of circumciſion in ſo advanced an age, was in all appearance to be put out of the condition of ſeeing himſelf a father—The pain which circumciſion produced was *extremely ſenſible*, eſpecially to grown people; this we may infer from the example of the Shechemites *." Sir JOHN CHARDIN ſays; "I have heard from divers renegadoes, in the Eaſt, who had been circumciſed, ſome at thirty, ſome at forty years of age, that the circumciſion had occaſioned them a *great deal of pain*, and that they were obliged to keep their bed upon it, at leaſt *twenty*, or *twenty-two* days †." To theſe authors I would add Mr. FINDLAY, who ſpeaks in the following manner: "MAIMONIDES having ſaid, *Circumciſion was a rite of ſuch a nature, that no perſon would perform it upon himſelf or his children, but on account of religion*; gives the reaſon of his judgment: *For it is not a ſlight hurt of the leg, or burning of the arm, but a thing* MOST HARSH *and* UNEASY—So likewiſe PHILO ſpeaks of circumciſion, as an operation attended with *grievous anguiſh*. It may even ſeem to have been *hazardous to life*. For LIGHTFOOT, in his Exercitations upon 1 Cor. vii. 19. produces ſome paſſages from Rabbinical writings, in which mention is made of a man whoſe brethren had *died* of circumciſion. Nay, one from the Jeruſalem Talmud itſelf, where R. NATHAN ſays, *There was a woman in Ceſarea of Cappadocia, who had loſt three ſons ſucceſſively by it* ‡." Now, can any thing

* *Diſſertat. upon the Old Teſt.* Vol. I. p. 141. 143. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's Tranſlation.

† In Mr. HARMER's *Obſervations*, Vol. II. p. 498, 499.

‡ *Vindicat. of the Sacred Books*, p. 278. *Note.*

thing ſimilar be aſſerted, with propriety, concerning the baptiſmal immerſion?

As to the ſuppoſed *indecency* of plunging, about which a hideous outcry is often raiſed, as if that, of itſelf, were a ſufficient conviction of our practice proceeding on a groſs miſtake, it is eaſy to anſwer; Whatever of this kind is objected by our Brethren, would have applied with incomparably greater force againſt the ancient rite of circumciſion. But let us hear what Pædobaptiſts themſelves have ſaid concerning this particular. CALVIN ſays, "This command, *Ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreſkin*, might, at firſt ſight, appear *extremely abſurd and ridiculous* *." WITSIUS, having deſcribed the painful rite, expreſſes himſelf thus; "On account of which ceremony, the Jews were contemptuouſly and by way of reproach called, *Apellæ* and *Recutiti*; becauſe they wanted that pellicle and little ſkin. But it pleaſed God, to confound all carnal wiſdom, and try the faith and obedience of his people, to appoint a rite, for the ſeal of his covenant, at which they might *bluſh*, and be almoſt *aſhamed* of performing it: like as he founded our whole ſalvation in a fact, which ſeems no leſs ſhameful to the fleſh, namely, the croſs of Chriſt †." F. FABRICIUS, when diſcourſing on the ſame ſubject, ſays; "I confeſs, that circumciſion, conſidered externally, that is, without a divine inſtitution, and without the deſign and ſignification of that inſtitution, might ſeem to be an exceedingly *ridiculous* and *ſhameful* rite ‡."—And were not ſome other appointments of Jehovah, under the Jewiſh OEconomy, ſuch as the cuſtoms of our country,

* *In* Gen. xvii. 11.

† *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. VIII. § 2.

‡ *Chriſtologia*, Diſſert. XI. § 16.

try, and preſent prevailing notions of, the *rational*, the *decent*, and the *uſeful*; would lead many perſons to conſider, as *puerile*, *indelicate*, and *unprofitable*? Such, if I miſtake not, were ſeveral of thoſe laws which related to ceremonial impurity: and yet the poſterity of Abraham, of both ſexes, were obliged to regard them with ſtrict punctuality. It muſt, therefore, be at our peril to pronounce that *indecent* which God requires.—But why ſuch complaints of indelicacy againſt the baptiſmal plunging, as performed in public aſſemblies? What immodeſty is there in the ſolemn immerſion of candidates for baptiſm, when properly cloathed; any more than there is, in the public and promiſcuous bathing of both ſexes, at Bath, Southampton, or any other place of a ſimilar kind*? As to the baptizing of perſons that are not properly cloathed, it has our cordial diſapprobation.

Further: For any of our oppoſers to imagine, that pouring, or ſprinkling, is neceſſary *now*, and in *theſe* countries, though not ſo in the apoſtolic age and in the Eaſtern parts; is a ſuppoſition intirely void of proof, and far from becoming the character of any Proteſtant. In anſwer to a plea of this kind, one of our Diſſenting Brethren, when engaged in the Popiſh controverſy, ſays; "Let us conſider, Things neceſſary—at *one* time, and not at *another*? Neceſſary in *our* days, and not ſo in the days of the *Apoſtles*? Neceſſary to Chriſtians of *later* ages, and not ſo to the *primitive* Chriſtians? Sure, this cannot be true: I always thought *that* to be the Chriſtian faith, which was *once*, and *at once*, delivered to the ſaints, by Chriſt and his Apoſtles †."—Again: For any to practiſe

* See Dr. STENNETT's *Anſw. to* Mr. ADDINGTON, Part I. p. 31, 32. *Note.*

† Mr. SMYTH's *Serm. at Salter's Hall, on the Church of Rome's Claim of Infallib.* p. 30, 31.

practiſe aſperſion, on a preſumption that it includes the whole *eſſence* of baptiſm, and to avoid *ſuppoſed indecency*, even while they acknowledge that immerſion was appointed by Chriſt and uſed by the Apoſtles; is to impeach the wiſdom of our divine Lawgiver, by implicitly ſaying, That he did not well conſider to what a pitch the refined and virtuous delicacy of his diſciples would ariſe in our modern times. Beſides, it is to proceed on the ſame foundation with the Council of Conſtance, when forbidding the uſe of the ſacred cup to the people: for that prohibition was founded on a ſuppoſition, that communicants receive the *intire* body and blood of Chriſt, under the ſpecies of bread; and it was intended to preclude certain *dangers* and *ſcandals*, ſuppoſed to ariſe from the ancient practice *. The members of that Council, it ſeems, diſcovered ſomething as *dangerous* and as *offenſive*, in adminiſtering both ſpecies at the holy table; as others do, in the baptiſmal immerſion: and they were equally unwilling to acknowledge, that the ſubſtance of the ſacred ſupper was at all impaired, by their innovation. But would any authority on earth bear, without marks of diſpleaſure, to be treated in a ſimilar manner? We will ſuppoſe, for example, that a ſubject, or a ſervant, neglects the law of a magiſtrate, or the command of a maſter; we will further ſuppoſe him called to account for his diſobedience, and that, in his own vindication he ſays: "I conſidered the preciſe performance of the order as of little importance, provided it were but *ſubſtantially* obſerved. I have, therefore, ſubſtituted ſomething in its room that will do quite as well, without being attended with ſuch inconveniencies, as would have

* Vid. CARANZAE *Sum. Concil.* p. 389. Lovan. 1681. VENEM. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. VI. p. 193.

have been inſeparable from a punctual compliance." Would this be thought a modeſt excuſe, or a juſt vindication? It may be anſwered, in that obſolete phraſe of our biblical verſion, *I trow not.*

From the foregoing conſiderations it appears, I think, with ſuperior evidence, that the ſacred maxim, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*; muſt be miſapplied, in the caſe before us. For, if it will apply, ſo as to juſtify ſprinkling in a cold country, when immerſion was *intended* by our Lord, *ſubmitted* to by him, *commanded* by him, and *practiſed* by his Apoſtles; it would certainly have applied much more ſtrongly in many caſes, under the former OEconomy: for the maxim is founded in *moral* truth, which is the ſame in every nation and in all ages. That *God loves mercy better than ſacrifice*, was always a fact, ſince man tranſgreſſed and ritual obedience was required: nor did our Lord give the leaſt intimation, by his application of that important ſaying, of any thing contained in it being *peculiar* to goſpel times. The Chriſtian diſpenſation is, indeed, much ſuperior to that of the ancient Hebrews: but that ſuperiority is far from conſiſting, in *our* having more liberty to neglect, alter, or tranſgreſs the divine commands, than *they* had. No; the diſciples of Chriſt are as much obliged to regard the poſitive laws of the New Teſtament, with *ſtrict* punctuality; as the Jews were to obſerve that divine ritual, which is contained in the books of Moſes: and our ſuperior privileges are ſo many *additional motives* to perpetual obedience. Whenever any one, therefore, is inclined to ſubſtitute *aſperſion* for *plunging*, on a ſuppoſition of the *latter* being either burdenſome, or indelicate, and on the foundation of thoſe condeſcending words, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*; he ſhould recollect the command of God to Abraham,

Abraham, *Ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreſkin*; and ſee how far it would have applied there, before he ventures to alter a poſitive appointment of Chriſt, on that ground.

Were it allowable to proſecute the hint which ſome of theſe learned authors give, No 5. 7. 12. that is, for *charity* and *neceſſity* to erect a court of *Chancery*; to *ſit in judgment* on the equity of God's commands; and either *mitigate* their ſeverity, or *diſpenſe* with them, as we think proper; ſomething, indeed, might then be done, that would effectually obviate all ſhivering apprehenſions, and every painful modeſt feeling, which the word *baptize* would otherwiſe excite in the breaſts of any. Nor would the relief, afforded by ſuch a court, be confined to the frightful idea of immerſion; for it would extend its benign influence to every other caſe, in which our ſovereign wills happen to claſh with poſitive laws: becauſe the uniform language of its decrees would be that of Peter to Chriſt; SPARE THYSELF. While, however, the validity of ſuch a court of equity remains doubtful; it will be our wiſdom, when the Moſt High ſpeaks, not to reaſon and object, but to adore and obey.—How ſtrange it is that Proteſtant authors ſhould ever talk of *diſpenſing* with divine laws, or of *mitigating* their ſeverity! But as Dr. WITHERSPOON obſerves, "When men will not conform their *practice* to the principles of pure and undefiled religion, they ſcarce ever fail to endeavour to accommodate *religion* to their own practice*." Mr. HENRY, alſo, has juſtly remarked, that "in ſacraments, where there is appointed ſomething of an outward ſign, the inventions of men have been too fruitful of additions [and alterations too;] for which they have

* *Treatiſe on Regeneration*, p. 178.

have pleaded a great deal of *decency* and ſignificancy; while the ordinance itſelf hath been thereby *miſerably obſcured and corrupted**."

REFLECT. V. Suffer me now to reaſon and remonſtrate in the language of Mr. CHARNOCK, and then to conclude this part of my ſubject with the ingenuous confeſſion of a learned foreigner. "The laws of God, who is *ſumma ratio*, ſays the famous CHARNOCK, are purely founded upon the trueſt reaſon, though every one of them may not be ſo clear to us. Therefore, they that make [any] *alteration* in his precepts, either dogmatically or practically, controul his wiſdom and charge him with folly. When men will obſerve *one* part of his law, and not *another*; pick and chooſe where they pleaſe; hence it is that ſinners are called *fools* in Scripture. 'Tis certainly inexcuſable folly, to contradict undeniable and infallible wiſdom. If infinite prudence hath framed the law, why is not *every part* of it obſerved? If it were not made with the beſt wiſdom, why is *any thing* of it obſerved †?" —The ingenuous confeſſion to which I refer, is that of M. DE LA ROQUE, and it is as follows. "The greateſt part of them [the Proteſtants,] hitherto baptize only by *ſprinkling*: but it is certainly an *abuſe*; and this practice which they have retained from the *Romiſh* church, without a due examination of it, as well as many other things which they ſtill retain, renders their baptiſm *very defective*. It *corrupts* both the inſtitution and ancient uſage of it, and the relation it ought to have to faith, repentance, and regeneration. Monſieur BOSSUET's remark, that dipping was in uſe for *thirteen hundred* years, deſerves our ſerious conſideration, and our acknowledgement

* *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 153

† *On Man's Enmity to God*, p. 112, 113.

ledgement thereupon, that we have not ſufficiently examined all that we have retained from the Romiſh church; that, ſeeing her moſt learned prelates now inform us, that it was SHE *firſt aboliſhed* a uſage authoriſed by ſo many ſtrong reaſons, and by ſo many ages, ſhe has done very ill on this occaſion, and that we are *obliged* to return to the ancient practice of the church, and to the inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt. I do not ſay, that baptiſm by aſperſion is null; that is not my opinion: but it muſt be confeſſed, if ſprinkling deſtroys not the ſubſtance of baptiſm, yet it *alters* it, and in ſome ſort *corrupts* it; 'tis *a defect which ſpoils* its lawful form*."

CHAP. VIII.

No EXPRESS PRECEPT, *or* PRECEDENT, *in the New Teſtament, for Pædobaptiſm.*

BP. BURNET: "There is no *expreſs precept*, or *rule*, given in the New Teſtament, for baptiſm of infants." *Expoſit. of XXXIX Articles*, Art. XXVII. p. 383.

2. Dr. WALL: "Among all the perſons that are recorded as baptized by the Apoſtles, there is no expreſs mention of *any infant*—There is no expreſs mention, indeed, of *any children* baptized by him," i. e. John the Baptiſt. *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Introduct. p. 1. 55.

3. Mr. FULLER: "We do freely confeſs, that there is neither *expreſs precept*, nor *precedent*, in the New Teſtament for the baptizing of infants"—

There

*In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſwer to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 185, 186.

There are many things "which Jeſus did, which are *not written*; among which, for aught appears to the contrary, the *baptizing* of theſe infants [Luke xviii. 15—17] might be one of them." *Infant's Advocate*, p. 71. 150.

4. Mr. MARSHALL: "I grant, that, in ſo many words, it is *not found* in the New Teſtament, that they [infants] ſhould be baptized: no *expreſs example* where children were baptized—*Expreſs command* there is, that they [the Apoſtles] ſhould teach the Heathen, and the Jews, and make them diſciples, and then baptize them." In Mr. TOMBES's *Examen*, p. 110. 161.

5. LUTHER: "It *cannot be proved*, by the ſacred Scripture, that Infant baptiſm was inſtituted by Chriſt, or begun by the firſt Chriſtians after the Apoſtles." In A. R's *Vanity of Inf. Bap.* Part II. p. 8.

6. Mr. BAXTER: "If there can be *no example* given in Scripture, of any one that was baptized without the profeſſion of a ſaving faith, nor *any precept* for ſo doing; then muſt we not baptize any without it. But the antecedent is true; therefore ſo is the conſequent—In a word, I know of no one word in Scripture, that giveth us the leaſt intimation that ever man was baptized without the profeſſion of a ſaving faith, or that giveth the leaſt encouragement to baptize any upon another faith." *Diſputat. of Right to Sac.* p. 149. 151.

7. Mr. OBED WILLS: "Chriſt did many things that were *not recorded*, and ſo did the Apoſtles; whereof this was *one*, for aught we know, *the baptizing infants*——CALVIN, in his fourth book of Inſtitutes, Chap. XVI. confeſſeth, that it is *no where* expreſſly mentioned by the Evangeliſts, that *any one child* was by the Apoſtles baptized. To the ſame

purpoſe are STAPHILUS, MELANCTHON, ZUINGLIUS quoted." *Inf. Bap. aſſerted and vindicated*, Part II. Chap. I. p. 37. 40. 199, 200.

8. VITRINGA: "That ſome in the ancient church, long ago, doubted, and that others now doubt, whether infants ought to be baptized, proceeds principally, I think, from hence; *It is not related as a fact*, in the Goſpels and Acts of the primitive church, that infants were baptized by Chriſt, or by the Apoſtles." *Obſervat. Sac.* L. II. C. VI. § 2.

9. Mr. SAMUEL PALMER: "There is nothing in the words of the inſtitution, nor in any after accounts of the adminiſtration of this rite, reſpecting the baptiſm of infants: there is not a *ſingle precept* for, nor *example* of, this practice through the whole New Teſtament." *Proteſt. Diſſent. Anſw. to* Dr. PRIESTLEY's *Free Addreſs on the Lord's Sup.* Let. I. p. 7.

10. STAPFERUS: "There is not any *expreſs command*, in the holy Scripture, concerning the baptiſm of infants." *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Cap. III. § 1647.

11. LIMBORCH: "There is no *expreſs command* for it [Infant baptiſm] in Scripture; nay, *all* thoſe paſſages wherein baptiſm is commanded, do immediately relate to *adult* perſons, ſince they are ordered to be *inſtructed*, and faith is pre-requiſite as a *neceſſary qualification*, which are peculiar to the adult alone. There is *no inſtance that can be* produced, from whence it may indiſputably be inferred, that *any child* was baptized by the Apoſtles. The neceſſity of Pædobaptiſm was never aſſerted by any Council, before that of Carthage, held in the year four hundred and eighteen—We own that there is

no

no precept, nor undoubted inſtance, in Scripture, of Infant baptiſm; but this is not enough to render it unlawful." *Comp. Syſt. Div.* B. V. Chap. XXII. Sect. II.

12. M. DE LA ROQUE: "As to the baptiſm of infants, I confeſs there is nothing *formal* and *expreſs* in the goſpel, to juſtify the neceſſity of it; and the paſſages that are produced, do, *at moſt*, only prove that it is *permitted*, or rather, that it is *not forbidden* to baptize them. If all the Anabaptiſts only held to this, without condemning this practice as criminal and ſacrilegious, they would have reaſon on their ſide, and would ſay nothing but what is founded on ſuch principles as are common to all Proteſtants." In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſw. to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 188.

13. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS: "Examples prove, that *adults*, both Jews and Gentiles, were baptized. Concerning the baptiſm of *infants*, there are, indeed, *no examples* of which we read." *Cent.* I. L. II. C. VI. p. 381.

14. ERASMUS: "It is *probable* the baptiſm of infants was inſtituted by the Apoſtles; nevertheleſs, if one doubt thereof he ſhould *not* be condemned." In Mr. WILLS's *Inf. Bap. aſſerted and vindicated*, Part II. p. 39, 40.

15. Mr. T. BOSTON: "It is plain that he [Peter, in Acts ii. 38.] requires their repentance antecedently to baptiſm, as neceſſary to qualify them for the right and due reception thereof. And there is *no example* of baptiſm recorded in the Scriptures, where any were baptized but ſuch as appeared to have a ſaving intereſt in Chriſt." *Works*, p. 384.

16. Mr. CAWDRY: "The Scriptures are not *clear*, that Infant baptiſm was an apoſtolical practice."

tice." In Mr. CROSBY's *Hiſt. Bap.* Vol. III. Pref. p. 53.

17. Dr. FIELD: "The baptiſm of infants—is therefore named a *tradition*, becauſe it is not *expreſſly delivered* in Scripture, that the Apoſtles did baptize infants; nor any *expreſs precept* there found, that they ſhould do ſo." *On the Church*, p. 375.

18. Bp. PRIDEAUX: "*Pædobaptiſm*, and the change of the Jewiſh ſabbath into the Lord's day, reſt on no other divine right than *epiſcopacy*." *Faciul. Controverſ.* Loc. IV. Sect. III. p. 210.

19. Bp. SANDERSON: "The baptiſm of *infants*, and the *ſprinkling* of water in baptiſm, inſtead of immerſing the whole body,—muſt be exterminated from the church—according to their principle: i. e. that nothing can be lawfully performed, much leſs required, in the affairs of religion, which is not either *commanded* by God, in the Scripture, or at leaſt recommended by a *laudable example*." *De Obligat. Conſcient.* Prælect. IV. § 17, 18.

20. Bp. STILLINGFLEET: "Whether baptiſm ſhall be adminiſtered to infants, or no, is not ſet down in *expreſs words*, but left to be gathered by analogy and conſequences." *Irenicum*, Part II. Chap. IV. p. 178.

21. Dr. TOWERSON: "That which ſeems to ſtick much with the adverſaries of Infant baptiſm, and is accordingly urged at all times againſt the friends or aſſerters of it, is, *The want of an expreſs command*, or direction, for the adminiſtering of baptiſm to them. Which objection ſeems to be the more reaſonable, becauſe baptiſm, as well as other ſacraments, receiving all its force from *inſtitution*, they may ſeem to have no right to, or benefit by it, who appear not by the inſtitution of that ſacrament

to

to be intitled to it; but rather, by the *qualifications* it requires, to be excluded from it." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part. XI. p. 349, 350.

22. Mr. WALKER: "Where authority from the Scripture fails, there the cuſtom of the church is to be held as a law——It doth not follow, that our Saviour gave no precept for the baptizing of infants, becauſe *no ſuch precept* is particularly expreſſed in the Scripture; for our Saviour ſpake many things to his diſciples concerning the kingdom of God, both before his paſſion and alſo after his reſurrection, which are *not written* in the Scriptures; and who can ſay, but that among thoſe many *unwritten ſayings* of his, there might be an *expreſs precept* for Infant baptiſm?" *Modeſt Plea for Inf. Bap.* p. 221. 368.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. As theſe Pædobaptiſts unanimouſly agree, that there is neither *expreſs precept*, nor *plain example*, for Infant baptiſm, recorded in the New Teſtament; ſo it appears, from one or another of them, That the paſſages uſually produced for it, only prove that it is *permitted*, or *not forbidden*. See No. 12.—That all thoſe places where baptiſm is commanded, regard none but *adults*. See No 11.—That Pædobaptiſm muſt be gathered by *analogy* and *conſequences*. See No 20.—That there is *no inſtance* from which it may be inferred, incontrovertibly, that any child was baptized by the Apoſtles. See No 11.—That Infant baptiſm reſts on the *ſame foundation*, as dioceſan Epiſcopacy. See No 18.—And, that *unwritten* truth, (i. e. weak ſurmiſe) is a *ſuccedaneum* for expreſs precept and plain precedent. See No 3. 7. 14. 22. Such conceſſions are our opponents

ponents obliged to make, in reference to this affair! And here I demand, in the remarkable words of Mr. BAXTER; "What man dare go in a way which hath neither *precept* nor *example* to warrant it, from a way that hath *a full current* of both*?"

REFLECT. II. That the teſtimony of Scripture, in favour of any religious tenet or practice, is of great importance, none but Infidels will dare to deny: for even the Papiſts themſelves, notwithſtanding their two great reſources of confidence, tradition and infallibility, are never willing to wave the advantage of pleading it in their own defence, if it can be done with the leaſt appearance of reaſon. That the ſacred writings are our only rule of doctrine and worſhip, was the grand principle of the Reformation; and happy would it have been, if each concerned in that excellent work had uniformly acted under its influence. On this foundation, and in many caſes, Proteſtant writers have ſucceſsfully oppoſed the Papal ſyſtem. Nor is any thing more frequent with them, when engaged in that controverſy, than a recurrence to this capital principle, and an adoption of CHILLINGWORTH's maxim: THE BIBLE ONLY IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS. Here, that excellent ſaying of BASIL is pleaded; "It is a manifeſt miſtake, in regard to faith, and a clear evidence of pride, either to *reject* any of thoſe things which the Scripture contains; or to *introduce* any thing that is not written in the ſacred page†." That of AMBROSE alſo, is held in high eſteem; "Where the Scripture is *ſilent*, who ſhall *ſpeak*‡?" Nor is TERTULLIAN's maxim in leſs repute; "The Scripture

* *Plain Scrip. Proof*, p. 24. † In Bp. TAYLOR's *Liberty of Propheſying*, Sect. V. No. XI. p. 97. ‡ In *Morning Exerciſe againſt Popery*, Serm. VII. p. 214.

Scripture *forbids* what it does *not mention**." Here they tell us, that "we ought to reſpect the *ſilence* of the Scripture †;" and they lay it down as a general rule, that "no one need be aſhamed of not knowing what God has not revealed;" becauſe "he that would go further, gives up his wiſdom and endangers his ſafety ‡." They further aſſure us, "that divine Revelation is the only foundation, the only rule, and the only law, of all religious worſhip that is pleaſing to God, or accepted by him;" and that "when once a perſon maintains it allowable to paſs over the limits of the divine command, there is nothing to hinder him from running the moſt extravagant lengths §." In proof of which, they reaſon thus: "All worſhip, is obedience; obedience reſpects authority; and authority exerts itſelf in commands. And if this authority be not the authority of GOD, the worſhip performed in obedience unto it, is not the worſhip of *God*, but of *him*, or *them*, whoſe commands and authority are the reaſon and cauſe of it. It is the authority of God alone, that can make any worſhip to be *religious*; or the performance of it, to be an act of obedience to *him*. God would never allow that the will and wiſdom of any of his creatures, ſhould be the riſe, rule, or meaſure of his worſhip, or any part of it, or any thing that belongs unto it. This honour he hath reſerved unto himſelf, neither will he part with it unto any other. He alone knows what becomes his own greatneſs and holineſs, and what tends to the

* *De Monog.* † Mr. CLAUDE's *Eſſay on Comp. of a Serm.* Vol. I. p. 316. ‡ Dr. ELLIS's *Knowledge of Divine Things from Revelation*, p. 434. Edit. 2d. § Dr. OWEN's *Theologoumena*, L. IV. Digreſſ. III. § 8. L. V. C. XV. § 2.

the advancement of his glory. Hence the Scripture abounds with ſevere interdictions and comminations againſt them, who ſhall preſume to do, or appoint any thing, in his worſhip, *beſides* or *beyond* his own inſtitution*."—They inſiſt, that he who "ſhall appoint with what God ſhall be *worſhipped*, muſt appoint what that is by which he ſhall be pleaſed——By nothing, therefore, can he be worſhipped, but by what himſelf hath declared that he is well pleaſed with"—That, "to worſhip God, is an act of *obedience* and of *duty*, and therefore muſt ſuppoſe a *commandment*; and is not of our choice, ſave only that we muſt chooſe to obey"——And, conſequently, "He that ſays God is rightly worſhipped, by an act or ceremony, concerning which himſelf hath no way expreſſed his pleaſure, is *ſuperſtitious*, or a *will-worſhipper* †."——They inform us, that "a practice [in religious worſhip] not being *enjoined*, is *forbidden*;—being *diſallowed*, is *reprobated* ‡."—That, "the declared will of God being the moſt certain and happy rule of man's practice, eſpecially in *thoſe duties* which have no foundation, ſave in divine revelation; it is the *greateſt arrogance* and *affront* to the wiſdom and will of our Lawgiver, to contradict him therein §." That, "to preſcribe any thing [in religious worſhip] which God hath not commanded, though he hath *not* forbidden it; is ſuch an *invaſion of his prerogative*, that he hath puniſhed it by a remarkable judgment. Lev. x. 1. ‖"—That "in religious matters, and eſpecially in the worſhip of God,

* Dr. OWEN, *on Hebrews* i. 6. Vol. I. p. 99. † Bp. TAYLOR's *Ductor Dub.* B. II. Chap III. p. 347, 348. ‡ Bp. HURD's *Introduc. to Stud. of Proph.* p. 393. Edit. 1. § *Morning Exerciſe ag. Pop.* Serm. XXII. p 760. ‖ Mr. CHARNOCK, *On Man's Enmity to God*, p. 97.

God, it is not only ſinful to go *contra ſtatutum*, but to go *ſupra ſtatutum*. Or, to ſpeak home in the caſe, in religious matters acting *ſupra ſtatutum*, is all one with acting *contra ſtatutum*. Therein God's *not* requiring is equivalent to *forbidding*; and doing *more* than he commandeth, to doing *contrary* to it*." And, finally, "that the *ſilence* of the Scripture;" is a ſufficient ground of rejecting the *ſign of the croſs*, *exorciſm*, and ſimilar appendages of baptiſm, in the church of Rome; becauſe thoſe things "*not being written* in the ſacred Volume, are therefore *condemned*†."

REFLECT. III. Such being the grounds of thoſe arguments, and the tenour of that reaſoning, which are uſed againſt the unſcriptural ceremonies of the Romiſh church; what ſhould hinder a fair application of the ſame principles and the ſame arguments to Pædobaptiſm, if there be neither precept nor precedent for it, in the ſacred Volume? No Proteſtant, I preſume, will queſtion the propriety of CHILLINGWORTH's remark, or the juſtneſs of that inference to which it leads, when, reaſoning againſt the Papal infallibility, he ſays: "That our Saviour deſigned the biſhop of Rome for this office, and yet would not *ſay ſo*, nor cauſe it to be written ſo much as *once*, by any of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain conſequences; he that can believe it, let him believe it‡."—Is, then, the infallibility of the Roman

* *Vanity of Human Inventions*, p. 23, 24.

† MASTRICHT *Theolog*, L. VII. C. IV. § 19. TURRET. *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Loc. XIX. Quaeſt. XVIII. § 3, 4.

‡ *Relig. Proteſt.* p. 61. in Mr. FOOTE's *Plain Account*, p. 131.

pontiff, ſo ſtrange and ſo incredible to Proteſtants, becauſe it is not once mentioned by Chriſt or his Apoſtles; and ſhall any of our Brethren charge us with groſs ignorance or ſtrong prejudice, for oppoſing Infant baptiſm, while they themſelves allow that it is not ſo much as *once* expreſſly mentioned in all the New Teſtament? Were the Papal infallibility a fact, it muſt be conſidered as a poſitive appointment of our divine Lord; an appointment reſulting merely from his own ſovereign pleaſure; and, conſequently, it would be impoſſible for us to know any thing about it further than revealed in the Bible. And is not this the caſe in regard to Pædobaptiſm? May not we, therefore, with a little alteration, adopt the language of Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, and ſay; That our Saviour deſigned infants ſhould be baptized, and yet would not *ſay ſo*, nor cauſe it to be written ſo much as *once* by Evangeliſts or Apoſtles; though they often mention baptiſm, as *appointed*, as *practiſed*, as *important*; but leave the claim of infants on that ordinance to be made out by the long labour of inferential proof—by a conſideration of, Proſelyte baptiſm, Jewiſh circumciſion, the Abrahamic covenant, and ſuch paſſages of Scripture where baptiſm is either not mentioned at all, or mentioned only in reference to adults;—he that *can* believe it, let him believe it?—Or, ſhall we renounce theſe Proteſtant principles of the famous CHILLINGWORTH, and follow the example of FISHER, the Jeſuit? who, when vindicating the worſhip of images, ſays: "In the Scripture there is no *expreſs* practice nor precept of worſhipping the image of Chriſt: yet there be principles which, the light of nature ſuppoſed, convince adoration to be lawful*."

Many

* In *Popery Confuted by Papiſts*, p. 127.

Many were the poſitive rights ordained by Jehovah, in the ancient Jewiſh church: ſome of which were intended for the people at large, and others for particular characters among them. There is not, however, that I remember, a ſingle inſtance of any ritual ſervice deſigned for perſons of a particular deſcription; and of thoſe very perſons, whether prieſts, Levites, or others, being under a neceſſity of infering their intereſt in that ſervice by a chain of reaſoning from remote principles. No, the perſons whoſe duty it was to regard the rite, were plainly deſcribed, as well as the manner of performing it; ſo that the moſt ignorant among them, as far as we can perceive, were at no loſs in that reſpect.—To imagine, therefore, that the firſt poſitive rite of religious worſhip in the Chriſtian church, is left in ſo vague a ſtate as Pædobaptiſm ſuppoſes, is not only contrary to the analogy of divine proceedings in ſimilar caſes, but renders it morally impoſſible for the *bulk* of Chriſtians to diſcern the *real* grounds on which the ordinance is adminiſtered. For, doubtleſs, a great majority of thoſe who profeſs Chriſtianity, are quite incapable of entering into ſeveral ſubjects, the diſcuſſion of which is found ſo neceſſary, by learned men, in order to eſtabliſh the right of infants to baptiſm. On this plan of proceeding, a plain unlettered man, with the New Teſtament only in his hand, though ſincerely deſirous of learning from his Lord, what baptiſm is, and to whom it belongs; is not furniſhed with *ſufficient documents* to form a concluſion. No; he muſt ſtudy the records of Moſes, and well underſtand the covenant made with Abraham, as the father of the Jewiſh nation. Stranger ſtill! he muſt, according to the opinion of many, become a diſciple of thoſe who are the humble pupils of Jewiſh Rabbies—

bies—of thoſe learned authors, who, being well verſed in the writings of MAIMONIDES, and in the volumes of the *Talmud*, imagine themſelves to have imported into the Chriſtian church a great ſtock of intelligence, concerning the mind of Chriſt, relative to the proper ſubjects of baptiſm. For it is thence only he is able to learn, that the children of proſelytes were baptized along with their parents, when admitted members of the Jewiſh church: and thence alſo he muſt infer, that our Lord condeſcended to borrow of his enemies an important ordinance of religious worſhip for his own diſciples.—Nor is this all: He muſt ſtudy the antiquated rite of circumciſion. He muſt know, to whom it belonged, and the reaſons why. Then he muſt compare it with baptiſm, in this, that, and the other particular: after which he muſt draw a genuine inference, reſpecting the point in hand.—Nor has he yet performed the arduous taſk. For as the New Teſtament ſays nothing expreſſly about the object of his inquiry, he muſt ſift the meaning of ſeveral paſſages in ſacred writ, that ſay not a word about it, in order to find, that infants, of a certain deſcription, are intitled to baptiſm. For inſtance: He muſt conſider 1 Cor. vii. 14. in a very particular manner. Here he muſt ſettle what is meant by the word *ſanctified*, and by the term *holy*. He muſt accurately diſtinguiſh between the holineſs attributed to the *child*, and the ſanctification aſcribed to the *unbelieving parent*; ſo as to give the infant a right, which the parent has not, in a poſitive inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt.—When all this is duly performed, he muſt fortify his mind againſt the objections to which his fine-ſpun theory is liable. He muſt inquire, for example, ſo as to ſatisfy his own conſcience,

ſcience, Why, when our Lord gave commiſſion to *teach* and *baptize*; why, when his Apoſtles required a *profeſſion* of faith from thoſe whom they did baptize; no exception was made in favour of infants: and by a train of reaſoning he muſt at laſt infer, that, ſo far as appears to the contrary, they *meant* what they *never ſaid*, nor ever *did*. Such is the round-about logical labour which the ploughman has to perform, if he would not pin his faith on the ſleeve of the learned.—But if, on the other hand, we conſider poſitive precepts and apoſtolic examples, as the *only rule* of adminiſtering baptiſm; if we conſider Evangeliſts and Apoſtles as recording, *plainly* recording, all that our Lord meant us to know concerning this inſtitution; the labour of the moſt illiterate, who can read his own language, is both ſhort and eaſy. For, the New Teſtament being the only book that he wants to give him a complete idea of baptiſm, he has nothing to do but open that ſacred Volume; conſult a few expreſs commands and plain examples; conſider the natural and proper ſenſe of the words; and then, without the aid of commentators, or the help of critical acumen, he may ſafely decide on the queſtion before him: becauſe, our opponents themſelves being judges, we have in that code of divine law and hiſtory of apoſtolic practice, both expreſs *commands* and expreſs *examples* for baptizing ſuch as profeſs faith in Jeſus Chriſt; but for NONE ELSE.

When theſe things are duly conſidered, we ſhall not wonder that learned and eminent Pædobaptiſts have expreſſed themſelves as follows. Lord BROOKE, for inſtance, has made the following acknowledgement: "To thoſe that hold we may go no farther than Scripture, for doctrine or diſcipline, it may be very eaſy to err in this point now in hand [i. e. infant baptiſm;] ſince the Scripture ſeems not

to

to have *clearly determined* this particular *." Mr. BAXTER: "If the very baptiſm of infants itſelf, be *ſo dark* in the Scripture, that the controverſy is thereby become *ſo hard* as we find it; then to prove not only their baptiſm, but a new diſtinct end of their baptiſm,—will be a hard taſk indeed †." N. B. This acknowledgment is contained in his book, intitled, PLAIN SCRIPTURE PROOF *of Infants church memberſhip and baptiſm.* Dr. WALL: "At what age the children of Chriſtians ſhould be baptized; whether in infancy, or to ſtay till the age of reaſon; is not ſo clearly delivered, but that it admits of a diſpute that has *conſiderable perplexities* in it ‡." Mr. HENRY: "There are *difficulties* in this controverſy, which may puzzle the minds of well meaning Chriſtians §." Dr. ISAAC WATTS: "Though there be no ſuch *expreſs* and *plain* commands or examples of it [Infant baptiſm] written in Scripture, as we might have *expected*; yet there are ſeveral inferences to be drawn from what is written, which afford a juſt and reaſonable encouragement to this practice, and guard it from the cenſure of ſuperſtition and will worſhip ||." To theſe authors may be added, the very learned and excellent VITRINGA; who cautions Pædobaptiſts, how they ſtate the queſtion, diſputed between them and the Baptiſts, in the following manner: "He, in my opinion, that would argue prudently againſt the Anabaptiſts, ſhould not ſtate the point in controverſy thus; Whether infants, born of Chriſtian parents, *ought neceſſarily* to be baptized? but, Whether it be *lawful*, according to the Chriſtian diſcipline, to baptize them? Or, What *evil* is there

* *On Epiſcopacy*, Sect. II. Chap. VII. p. 97.
† *Plain Scrip. Proof*, p. 301. ‡ *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. XI. p. 547. § *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 70.
|| *Berry Street Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 180. 185.

there in the ceremony of baptizing infants*?" This great man was aware, that, as there is no precept for Infant baptiſm, in the New Teſtament, nor any example of it; ſo, to urge its neceſſity might endanger the whole cauſe. He knew, and honeſtly confeſſed, that Pædobaptiſm is *tender ground*; and that whoever walks upon it had need be careful how he treads.

REFLECT. IV. We are taught by various learned pens, that the practice of John, ſurnamed the Baptiſt, and the qualifications required of thoſe perſons for whom our Lord intended the ordinance, unite in excluding infants from a participation of it. "John admitted *none* to baptiſm, ſays the judicious TURRETTINE, but thoſe who confeſſed their ſins; becauſe his buſineſs was to baptize the adult†." With him Dr. WHITBY agrees, when he ſays; "It is not to be wondered at, that infants were not baptized during John's miniſtry; becauſe the baptiſm then uſed by John and Chriſt's diſciples, was only the baptiſm of repentance and faith in the Meſſiah which was for to come; of both which infants were *incapable*‡." —That the *qualifications* required of thoſe for whom our Lord intended the ordinance, do not agree to an infantile ſtate, appears from the declarations of many others. The celebrated COCCEIUS, for inſtance, informs us; "That ſacraments, properly ſpeaking, were inſtituted for *believers*, and given to them, Rom. iv. 11. that is, for thoſe, *who hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs*§." The language of LIMBORCH is remarkably ſtrong. "The ſubject of baptiſm, ſays that learned Arminian, to whom it is to be adminiſtered, is a *believer*; one who is endued with a true

* *Obſervat. Sac.* Tom. I. L. II. C. VII. § 9.
† *Inſtitut.* Tom. III. Loc. XIX. Quaeſt. XXII. § 14.
‡ *Annotat.* on Matt. xix. 13, 14.
§ *Sum. Doct. de Foed.* C. VI. § 209.

true faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and touched with a ſerious repentance for his paſt offences *." Profeſſor VENEMA ſpeaks to the following effect: "Faith and repentance—are prerequired in baptiſm. He who preſents himſelf as a candidate for baptiſm, profeſſes, by that very act, to be a Chriſtian; declares himſelf to have paſſed into the diſcipline of Chriſt. Hence Philip ſaid, *If thou believeſt with all thy heart, thou mayeſt*, Acts viii. 37. The command of Peter was, *Repent and be baptized*, Acts ii. 38. the effect of which was, that they who gladly and ſincerely believed his goſpel, were baptized—In baptiſm, therefore, we have a ſign and teſtimony of *preſent* regeneration; and in regard to the perſon baptized, a public demonſtration of it †." Mr. THOMAS BOSTON gives us, not only his own views of the ſubject, but thoſe alſo of Mr. RUTHERFORD and of URSINUS, in the following words: "The ſacraments are not converting, but *confirming* ordinances; they are appointed for the uſe and benefit of God's *children*, not of *others*; they are given to believers, *as* believers, as RUTHERFORD expreſſeth it, ſo that *none other* are capable of the ſame before the Lord——URSIN, upon that queſtion, *Who ought to come to the ſupper?* tells us, The ſacraments are appointed for the *faithful* and *converted* ONLY, to ſeal the promiſe of the goſpel to them, and confirm their faith ‡." Dr. GOODWIN thus: "Baptiſm *ſuppoſeth* regeneration ſure in itſelf firſt. Sacraments are never adminiſtered for to begin or work grace; you ſuppoſe children *to believe*, before you baptize them. Read all the Acts, ſtill it is ſaid, They *believed* and were baptized. I could give you a multitude of places for it §." "There are, or may be, innumerable perſons

* *Syſt. Div.* B. V. Chap. XXII. Sect. II. † *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. II. C. XIV. § 4. ‡ *Works*, p. 384, 385.
§ *Works* Vol. I. Part II. p. 200.

perſons baptized externally with water, ſays HOORNBEEKIUS, who yet are not real Chriſtians; neither were they rightly baptized, becauſe they were unbelievers: nor can they be juſtly ſaid to have baptiſm; not that which Chriſt appointed—Without faith, water baptiſm *cannot*, by any means, *be lawful:* for the command is, *Believe*, firſt; then alſo, and not otherwiſe, *be baptized.* Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized.* Acts ii. 41. *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.* Acts viii. 37. *If thou believeſt with all thy heart thou mayeſt* be baptized. Acts xvi. 31, 33 *." "A profeſſion of faith, ſays Dr. WATERLAND, was, from the beginning, *always* required of perſons before baptiſm. We have plain examples of, and alluſions to, ſomething of that kind, even in Scripture itſelf. Acts viii. 12, 37. 1 Pet. iii. 21. Upon theſe inſtances the Chriſtian church proceeded †." " Faith and repentance were the great things required, ſays Dr. WATTS, of thoſe that were admitted to baptiſm. This was the practice of John, this the practice of the Apoſtles, in the hiſtory of their miniſtry, Matt. iii. Acts ii. 38. and xix. 4. and viii. 37—Thoſe who are baptized, are *profeſſed* Chriſtians; they are *avowed* diſciples of Chriſt ‡." Once more: Dr. ERSKINE ſays, " I have fully ſhewn, that the ſeals of the covenant are, under the *New* Teſtament, peculiar to the *inwardly pious* §."—That theſe authors had any intention to impeach the propriety of Infant baptiſm, is not pretended; but whether the natural import of

* *Socin. Confut.* L. III. C. IV. Tom. III. p. 384. 389.
† *Eight Serm.* p. 317. Edit. 2. ‡ *Berry Street Serm.* Vol. II. p. 177, 178. § *Theolog. Diſſertations*, p. 82. See alſo Mr. JONATHAN EDWARDS *On Religious Affections*, p. 412. Boſton, 1768.

of their language be quite conſiſtent with it, the Reader will judge.

REFLECT. V. Some of theſe authors imagine, that Pædobaptiſm is *lawful*, though it be not commanded. But here they ſeem to forget, that baptiſm is a *poſitive* rite, and that, when practiſed, it is as an act of *divine worſhip*. A precept, therefore, or an example, muſt be neceſſary to warrant the performance of it; and, conſequently, to authorize its adminiſtration to any deſcription of perſons whatever. Whether *infants* only; whether *all* infants, or only *ſome*; and, if the latter, whether none but the children of *church members*, or of all that appear to be *converted*; or, finally, whether thoſe perſons only, who *profeſs faith* in Jeſus Chriſt, ſhould be baptized; are things which lay intirely at the ſovereign pleaſure of the Great Inſtitutor. His *will*, which is always perfectly wiſe and good, is the ſole determiner here. Now, as we cannot know his divine pleaſure, without it be revealed; as every intimation of his pleaſure is attended with divine authority; and as the whole of his revealed will is contained in the Scripture; if the ſacred page exhibit no *command* for Pædobaptiſm, nor any *example* of it, the lawfulneſs of baptizing infants muſt be a mere ſurmiſe—a conjecture, without probability. For, not to urge the common arguments againſt Popiſh ſuperſtition; and, waving that excellent maxim of AMBROSE, before mentioned, "Who ſhall *ſpeak* where the Scripture is *ſilent?*" I would only demand, whether the performance of a religious rite, in the name of JEHOVAH, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, can be lawful, if the Divine Majeſty have not appointed it? Or, is the name of HIM who is *a conſuming fire* ſo cheap, that we may borrow its

its moſt venerable ſanction to adorn and dignify our own inventions? Surely, if the performance of any thing, either does or can require the *moſt explicit* divine authority, it muſt be that, which, if performed at all, muſt be expreſſly done *in the* NAME of the Great Supreme. A requiſition to adminiſter baptiſm in that moſt holy Name, implies the ſtrongeſt prohibition of performing it in any manner, or on any ſubject, different from what is required by the law of adminiſtration. If, then, the law of proceeding, in that caſe made and provided, require that *infants* ſhould partake of the inſtitution; we, undoubtedly, muſt act a condemnable part in witholding it from them. If, on the contrary, that divine rubric, that ſacred canon, confine its adminiſtration to ſuch as *profeſs faith* in the Son of God; our opponents, for the ſame reaſon, muſt be highly culpable: becauſe their practice reſtrains it almoſt *intirely* to ſuch as lie under a natural incapacity of profeſſing repentance and faith.—We are frequently charged with being extremely fond of getting people into the water; but whether it be really ſo, I leave the impartial to judge. We, however, may ſay this for ourſelves, that we never immerſe a perſon in the ſublimeſt of all names, without his *conſent*; no, nor yet without his *explicit requeſt:* whereas thoſe who lodge the complaint againſt us are well aware, that it would in general be abſurd, for them to *aſk* the conſent of thoſe whom they ſprinkle in the ſame glorious Name; for they are certain it could not be granted. Beſides, they conſider the conſent of a parent, or of a proxy, as quite ſufficient, though the ſubject of the ordinance be ever ſo reluctant.

Further: Poſitive laws imply their negative. A command from undoubted authority, to perform an action

action in such a manner, and on such a subject, must be considered as prohibiting a different manner, and a different subject. So, for instance, when God commanded Abraham to circumcise his *male* posterity, on the *eighth* day; there was no necessity that a prohibition should be annexed, relating to any similar ceremony which might have been performed on *females*; nor to expressly forbid the circumcision of a *finger*, instead of the foreskin; nor to say in so many words, it shall not be performed on the *seventh* day. Those positive precepts, *Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin—He that is eight days old shall be circumcised*; plainly implying the forementioned prohibitions.—And so, when Jehovah commanded the Israelites to take a lamb, a *male* of the *first* year, for the paschal feast; there was no need to forbid the choice of an *ewe* lamb, nor yet a ram of the *second* or *third* year. So, likewise, when Paul, speaking of the sacred supper, says; *Let a man* examine himself, *and so let him eat*; there was no necessity of adding, Those who *cannot* examine themselves *ought not to eat*.—Thus in regard to the ordinance before us: Our Lord having given a commission to baptize those that are *taught*, without saying any thing elsewhere, by way of precept or of example, concerning such as are *not* instructed being included in that commission; there was no necessity for him to *prohibit* the baptizing of those who are *not* taught: much less to forbid the baptizing of infants, that *cannot* be taught, in order to render the baptism of them unlawful. We may safely conclude, therefore, that though negative arguments, in various cases, have no force; yet, in positive worship and ritual duty, they are, they must be valid. Otherwise, it will be impossible to vindicate the divine conduct, in punishing

puniſhing the ſons of Aaron, for *offering ſtrange fire*; or Uzzah, for *touching the ark*; ſeeing, neither the one nor the other of theſe particulars was expreſſly forbidden.

Remarkably ſtrong to our purpoſe, are the words of Dr. OWEN, on Heb. i. 5. "An argument taken *negatively*, ſays he, from the authority of the Scripture in matters of faith, or what relates to the worſhip of God, is valid and effectual, and here *conſecrated for ever* to the uſe of the church by the Apoſtle." And on thoſe words, *Our Lord ſprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moſes ſpake nothing concerning the prieſthood*, Heb. vii. 14. the ſame excellent author ſays: "This *ſilence* of Moſes in this matter, the Apoſtle takes to be a ſufficient argument to prove that the legal prieſthood did not belong, nor could be tranſferred unto the tribe of Judah. And the grounds hereof are reſolved into this general maxim; That whatever is not *revealed* and *appointed* in the worſhip of God, by *God himſelf*, is to be conſidered as *nothing*, yea, as that which is to be *rejected*. And ſuch he conceived to be the evidence of this maxim, that he choſe rather to argue from the *ſilence* of Moſes in general, than from the particular *prohibition*, that none, who was not of the poſterity of Aaron, ſhould approach unto the prieſtly office. So God himſelf condemneth ſome inſtances of falſe worſhip, on this ground, That he never *appointed* them; that they never *came into his heart*; and thence aggravates the ſin of the people, rather than from the *particular prohibition* of them, Jer. vii. 31."—That it may ſtill further appear we are not led by mere hypotheſis thus to reaſon and thus to conclude, I will preſent my Reader with an extract from another learned Pædobaptiſt and an able writer, who adopts the

the principle on which we argue in the preſent caſe, and conſiders it as applicable to laws and duties in general. "Since office, or duty, ſays HEINECCIUS, means an action conformable to *law*, it is plain that duty cannot be conceived without a law; that he does not perform a duty, who impoſes on himſelf what no law commands; that an action ceaſes to be duty, when the law, or the reaſon of the law ceaſes; and that when a law extends to *certain* perſons only, of two perſons who do the ſame action, the one *performs* his duty, and the other *acts contrary* to his duty*."—To all which I may add, unleſs the principle of reaſoning here adopted be juſt, the arguments of Proteſtants againſt unſcriptural ceremonies in the Romiſh communion, will almoſt univerſally fail of proving the ſeveral points for which they were produced.

REFLECT. VI. I will preſent the Reader with an extract from a celebrated Roman Catholic author, expreſſing the opinion that Papiſts have concerning the method which is uſed by Proteſtants in favour of Pædobaptiſm. The writer to whom I refer, is BOSSUET, the biſhop of Meaux, and his language is as follows. "As for infants, thoſe of the pretended Reformed religion indeed ſay, their baptiſm is founded on *the Scripture:* but they produce no paſſage expreſs to that purpoſe, but argue from very *remote*, not to ſay very *doubtful*, and even very *falſe* conſequences. 'Tis certain that all the proofs they bring from the Scripture on this ſubject, have no force at all; and thoſe that might have ſome ſtrength are deſtroyed by themſelves——The proofs that are drawn from the *neceſſity* of baptiſm, to compel men to allow it to infants, are deſtroyed by our Reformed gentlemen;

* *Syſtem of Univerſal Law*, B. I. Chap. V. § 121. Dr. TURNBULL's Tranſlation.

tlemen; and theſe that follow are ſubſtituted in their room, as they are noted in their Catechiſm, in their Confeſſion of faith, and in their Prayers. Namely, that the children of believers are born in the covenant, according to this promiſe, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy offspring to a thouſand generations.* From whence they conclude, that ſince the *virtue* and *ſubſtance* of baptiſm belongs to infants, it would be injurious to them to deny them the ſign, which is inferior to it. By a like reaſon they will find themſelves forced to give *the communion* together with baptiſm: for they who are in the covenant, are incorporated with Jeſus Chriſt; the infants of believers are in the covenant; therefore they are incorporated with Jeſus Chriſt. And having by this means, according to them, the *virtue* and *ſubſtance* of the communion; they ought to ſay, as they do of baptiſm, that the *ſign* of it cannot without injury be refuſed them*."

REFLECT. VII. To the tenour of this reaſoning it is often objected: That there is no *expreſs* command to baptize *believers.* With an air of confidence, in reference to this affair, Mr. ADDINGTON aſks and anſwers; "Is there no expreſs command of Chriſt to baptize *believers?* Not *one* in all the New Teſtament†." If, by an *expreſs* command, he mean theſe very words, *Baptize believers*; it is allowed. But what is that to the purpoſe, while the ideas conveyed by thoſe terms, are as *plainly* and *ſtrongly* expreſſed, as if the identical words had been repeatedly uſed? Nor will Mr. ADDINGTON deny this. With equal reaſon, therefore, does cardinal BELLARMINE object the want of theſe expreſs words, *The imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, againſt the Proteſtant doctrine of

* In Mr. STENNETT, againſt Mr. RUSSEN, p. 180. 182, 183. † *Summary of Chriſtian Miniſt. Reaſons*, p. 24.

of juſtification; or SOCINUS oppoſe the atonement, becauſe the term *ſatisfaction* is not ſyllabically uſed concerning that capital fact.—But let us reflect on a paſſage or two. Does not Chriſt ſay; *Preach the goſpel to every creature: he that* BELIEVETH *and is baptized ſhall be ſaved?* Is it not the language of his Evangeliſt, *If thou* BELIEVEST *with all thy heart, thou mayeſt* be baptized? Now, can any perſon thus *believe* the goſpel, without being a *believer?* Or, will this opponent aver, that neither of theſe paſſages *injoins* the adminiſtration of baptiſm to *believers?* Let him produce a text from the New Teſtament, that is equally expreſs for the baptiſm of infants, and we will immediately give up the argument.—Beſides, Mr. ADDINGTON well knows, that we connect the want of a *plain example*, with the want of an expreſs command, for Infant baptiſm. To have done our objection juſtice, he ought, therefore, to have put the queſtion thus; Is there no *expreſs command* of Chriſt, nor any *plain apoſtolic example*, for baptizing believers? and then he would have been far from teaching his catechumen to anſwer; "Not *one* in all the New Teſtament." Such a negative, to ſuch a queſtion, would have been an outrage on the common faith of the whole Chriſtian world: and yet, if you ſubſtitute the term *infants*, for the word *believers*, Pædobaptiſts themſelves muſt anſwer in the negative.

It is further objected; That there is neither precept nor example for baptizing the *children of Chriſtian parents* when they are grown up; and that, on the ſame principles, applied in ſimilar arguments, we muſt neither obſerve the *Lord's day*, nor admit *women* to the holy table. To which it is anſwered: As to the *firſt* idea ſuggeſted in the objection, it is quite ſufficient,

ſufficient, that we have both an expreſs command and plain examples for baptizing thoſe who are *taught*, who are *made diſciples* and *profeſs faith* in the Son of God; whether they be the adult offspring of Pagans, of Jews, or of Chriſtians. This is a full vindication of our conduct, when we baptize the children of believers, on a perſonal profeſſion.—As to the *Lord's day*, our opponents themſelves allow, that we have not only apoſtolic *examples* of aſſembling on the firſt day of the week, for the ſolemn duties of public devotion; but a plain intimation that this was the *common practice* of the primitive churches, Acts xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2: and therefore, the objector himſelf being judge, there is no force in what is alleged.—And as to the ſuppoſed want of an explicit warrant for admitting *women* to the holy table, we reply by demanding; Does not Paul, when he ſays, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat*, injoin a reception of the ſacred ſupper? Does not the term ανθρωπος, *man*, there uſed, often ſtand as a name of our ſpecies, without any regard to ſex *? Have we not the authority of Lexicographers, and, which is incomparably more, the ſanction of common ſenſe, for underſtanding it thus in that paſſage? Beſides, when the Apoſtle delivered to the church at Corinth what he had received of the Lord; did he not deliver a *command*, a command to the *whole church*, conſiſting of *women*, as well as of men? When he further ſays, *We being many, are one bread, and one body; for we all are partakers of that one bread:* does he not ſpeak of *women*, as well

* Mr. PARKHURST ſays; "Ανθρωπος is a name of the ſpecies, without reſpect to ſex." MINTERT; "Homo, in genere, ſive mas ſit, ſive fœmina." And SCHWARZIUS, "Homo; i. e. humana natura præditus, habens ea quae hominis natura poſtulat."

as men? 1 Cor. x. 17. and xi. 28. Compare alſo, Acts i. 13, 14. with Acts ii. 42—47. Again: Are there any *prerequiſites* for the holy ſupper, of which women are not equally capable as men? And are not male and female *one in Chriſt?* When we oppoſe the baptiſm of infants, it is not becauſe they are *infants*; but becauſe they neither *do*, nor *can* profeſs faith in the Son of God.

CHAP. IX.

No Evidence of Pædobaptiſm, before the latter End of the SECOND, *or the Beginning of the* THIRD *Century.*

SALMASIUS and SUICERUS: "In the *two firſt* centuries, no one was baptized, except, being inſtructed in the faith, and acquainted with the doctrine of Chriſt, he was able to profeſs himſelf a believer; becauſe of thoſe words, *He that believeth and is baptized.* Firſt, therefore, he was *to believe.* Thence the order of Catechumens in the church. Then, alſo, it was the conſtant cuſtom to give the Lord's ſupper to thoſe Catechumens, immediately after their baptiſm." *Epiſt.* ad JUSTUM PACIUM, apud VAN DALE *Hiſt. Baptiſm.* SUICERI *Theſaur. Eccleſ.* ſub voce Συναξις, Tom. II. p. 1136.

2. LUDOVICUS VIVES: "No one, in former times, was admitted to the ſacred baptiſtry, except he was of age; underſtood what the myſtical water meant; deſired to be waſhed in it; and expreſſed that deſire more than once. Of which practice we have yet a reſemblance in our baptiſm of infants. For an infant of only a day or two old, is yet aſked, *Whether*

Whether he will be baptized? and this queſtion is aſked three times. In whoſe name the ſponſors anſwer, *He does deſire it.*" *Annot. in* AUG. *de Civ. Dei*, L. I. C. XXVII.

3. M. FORMEY: "They baptized from this time, [the latter end of the ſecond Century] *infants* as well as adults." *Abridg. Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Vol. I. p. 33.

4. CURCELLÆUS: "The baptiſm of infants, in the two firſt centuries after Chriſt, was *altogether unknown*; but, in the third and fourth, was allowed by *ſome few*. In the fifth and following ages, it was generally received——The cuſtom of baptizing infants did not begin before the *third* age after Chriſt was born. In the former ages, no trace of it appears—and it was introduced without the command of Chriſt." *Inſtitut. Relig. Chriſt.* L. I. C. XII. *Diſſert. Secund. de Peccat. Orig.* § 56.

5. M. DE LA ROQUE: "The primitive church did not baptize infants; and the learned GROTIUS proves it, in his Annotations on the Goſpel. Even the practice of the Romiſh church is an evident token of it; for, with them, baptiſm muſt be deſired before they enter into the church, and 'tis the godfather that aſks it in the name of the child. A formal and expreſs profeſſion of faith muſt be made, which the godfather alſo makes in the child's name: a promiſe muſt be made, to renounce the world and the pomps of it, the fleſh and the devil; all which is done by the godfather in the name of the child. Is not this a viſible ſign, that formerly it was *the perſons themſelves*, who in their own name *deſired* baptiſm, made a *profeſſion* of their faith, and *renounced their paſt life*, to conſecrate themſelves to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt for the time to come?" In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſwer to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 188, 189.

6. Mr.

6. Mr. CHAMBERS: "It appears that in the primitive times *none* were baptized but *adults*." *Cyclopædia*, Art. BAPTISM.

7. JOHANNES BOHEMIUS: "In former times it was the cuſtom to adminiſter baptiſm only to thoſe that were inſtructed in the faith, and ſeven times, in the week before Eaſter and Pentecoſt, catechiſed, or aſked queſtions, and then upon a confeſſion of their faith they were baptized. But afterwards, when it was thought and judged neceſſary to everlaſting life to be baptized, it was ordained that new born children ſhould be baptized, and ſponſors were appointed to make a confeſſion of their faith and renounce the devil on their behalf." *De Gentium Moribus*, L. II. in A. R's *Vanity of Inf. Bap.* Part II. p. 9.

8. RIGALTIUS: "In the Acts of the Apoſtles we read, that *both men and women* were baptized, when they believed the goſpel preached by Philip, without any mention being made of *infants*. From the Apoſtolic age, therefore, to the time of TERTULLIAN, the matter is doubtful. Some there were, from that ſaying of our Lord; *Suffer little children to come to me* (to whom, nevertheleſs, our Lord did not command water to be miniſtred) who took occaſion to baptize new born infants. And, as if they had been tranſacting ſome ſecular affair with God, they offered *ſponſors*, or *ſureties*, to Chriſt, who engaged that they ſhould not depart from the Chriſtian faith when adult; which practice diſpleaſed TERTULLIAN." In Mr. STENNETT's *Anſwer to* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 74, 75.

9. Dr. HOLLAND: "In the firſt plantation of Chriſtianity amongſt the Gentiles, *ſuch only* as were of full age, after they were inſtructed in the principles of Chriſtian religion, were admitted to baptiſm."

baptiſm." In Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. II. p. 281.

10. VENEMA: "It is, indeed, certain, that Pædobaptiſm was practiſed in the Second Century: yet ſo, that it was not the *cuſtom* of the church, nor the *general* practice; much leſs was it generally eſteemed *neceſſary* that infants ſhould be baptized—TERTULLIAN has no where mentioned Pædobaptiſm among the *traditions* of the church, nor even among the *cuſtoms* of the church, that were publicly received and uſually obſerved: nay, he plainly intimates, that, in his time, it was yet a *doubtful* affair. For, in his book *de Baptiſmo*, Cap. XVIII. he diſſuades from the baptizing of infants, and proves, by certain reaſons, that the delay of it to a more mature age, is to be preferred; which he *certainly would not have done*, if it had been a *tradition* and a *public cuſtom* of the church, ſeeing he was *very tenacious of traditions*; nor, had it been a tradition, would he have failed to mention it. It is manifeſt, therefore, that nothing was then determined concerning the *time* of baptiſm; nay, he judged it ſafer, that *unmarried* perſons ſhould defer their baptiſm—Nothing can be affirmed, with certainty, concerning the cuſtom of the church before TERTULLIAN; ſeeing there is not any where, in more ancient writers, that I know of, undoubted mention of Infant baptiſm. JUSTIN MARTYR, in his ſecond Apology, when deſcribing baptiſm, mentions only that of *adults*. IRENÆUS alone, *contra Hæreſ.* L. II. C. 22. may be conſidered as refering to Pædobaptiſm, when he ſays; *Chriſt paſſed through all the ages of man, that he might ſave all by himſelf; all I ſay*, thus he proceeds, *who by him are regenerated to God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and perſons*

perſons advanced in age. For the word *regenerated* is wont to be uſed concerning baptiſm; and in that ſenſe, I freely admit, it *may* be here underſtood; yet I do not conſider it as undoubtedly ſo, ſeeing it is not *always* uſed in that ſenſe, eſpecially if no mention of baptiſm precede or follow, which is the caſe here: and here, to be *regenerated* by Chriſt, may be explained by *ſanctified*, that is, *ſaved* by Chriſt. The ſenſe, therefore, may be; That Chriſt paſſing through all the ages of man, intended to ſignify by his own example, that he came to ſave men of every age, and alſo to ſanctify or ſave infants. I conclude, therefore, that Pædobaptiſm *cannot* be certainly proved to have been practiſed before the times of TERTULLIAN; and that there were perſons in his age who deſired their infants might be baptized, eſpecially when they were afraid of their dying without baptiſm: which opinion TERTULLIAN oppoſed, and by ſo doing he intimates, that Pædobaptiſm began to prevail. Theſe are the things that may be affirmed with apparent certainty, concerning the *antiquity* of Infant baptiſm, after the times of the Apoſtles; *for more are maintained without ſolid foundation.*" *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. III. Secul. II. § 108, 109.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. That moſt of theſe authors were well verſed in the ancient monuments of the Chriſtian church, few of my Readers, acquainted with their characters, will deny; and being Pædobaptiſts, they were under no influence, from their avowed hypotheſis, to make ſuch declarations as theſe before us. Conſequently, we muſt conſider theſe learned men, as led by plain hiſtorical evidence, and by a commendable regard for truth, to expreſs their views of the

the caſe in this remarkable manner. Now ſuch conceſſions, from writers whoſe literary abilities cannot be queſtioned, and who are intirely free from ſuſpicion of *intending* to ſink the reputation of Pædobaptiſm; afford a ſtrong preſumption in our favour, ſo far as eccleſiaſtical antiquity is concerned in the diſpute. Nay, I may venture to add, conceſſions of this kind, from the pens of ſuch men, as SALMASIUS and SUICERUS, of RIGALTIUS and VENEMA, muſt rebuke that haughty confidence with which we are ſometimes treated, even by juvenile opponents; as if the higheſt and pureſt eccleſiaſtical antiquity were quite againſt us, and as if no man of learning and of impartiality would riſque a denial of it. But whether our oppoſers be hoary with learned age, or bloom with pricipitate youth, it muſt, I think, be confeſſed, that theſe authorities have ſufficient force to acquit us from the charge of ignorance, and of partiality to a favourite opinion, becauſe we maintain, That the two firſt centuries knew either nothing at all, or very little, of Infant baptiſm.—To the foregoing quotations I would here ſubjoin the atteſtation of an eccleſiaſtical writer in the ninth century. WALAFRIDUS STRABO, to whom I refer, ſpeaks as follows. "It ſhould be obſerved that, in the *primitive* times, the grace of baptiſm was uſually given to thoſe *only* who were arrived at ſuch maturity of body and mind, that they could underſtand what were the benefits of baptiſm; what was to be confeſſed and believed; and, finally, what was to be obſerved by thoſe that are regenerated in Chriſt*."

REFLECT. II. One of theſe learned men ſuppoſes, indeed, that a paſſage in IRENÆUS *may* be underſtood,

* Apud VOSSIUM, *Theſ. Theolog*, p. 429.

ſtood, as refering to Infant baptiſm; yet candidly confeſſes, it admits of a doubt, whether the ancient Father had any ſuch practice in view: nay, he aſſerts, that there is no *certainty* of Pædobaptiſm being practiſed before the time of TERTULLIAN. See No. 10. LE CLERC, however, ſeems confident, that the quotation from IRENÆUS, to which we advert, has no relation to baptiſm. For thus he ſpeaks: "We ſee nothing here concerning baptiſm: nor is there any thing relating to it, in the immediately preceding, or following words*."—Beſides, if theſe expreſſions, "Who by him are *regenerated* to God," ſignify the ſame as being *baptized*; they convey the idea of our Lord *himſelf* baptizing perſons of different ages. But this, we know, was far from being a fact; for *Jeſus himſelf baptized not*, John iv. 2. Of this the ancient writer could not be ignorant; and, therefore, it is not likely that he ſhould, in ſuch a connection, ſubſtitute the term *regenerated* for the word *baptized*. It is alſo worthy of obſervation, that the ſuppoſition againſt which we contend repreſents our Lord as coming into the world to ſave thoſe only who are baptized; an imagination which is abhorrent from truth, and ought not without the cleareſt evidence to be charged on the venerable ancient.

Incompetent, however, as the teſtimony of IRENÆUS is, in favour of Pædobaptiſm, Dr. WALL will have it ſpeak directly to the point; ſaying, "This is the firſt *expreſs* mention we have met with of infants baptized†." *Expreſs* mention! Then the terms, *baptized* and *regenerated*, muſt be perfectly equivalent; at leaſt, in the works of IRENÆUS, and the eccleſiaſtical

* *Hiſt Eccleſ.* Secul. II. Ann. 180. § 33. p. 778.
† *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part I. Chap. III. p. 16.

eccleſiaſtical authors of thoſe times. But this cannot be proved, as the learned and impartial VENEMA acknowledges. See No. 10.—Yet while we inſiſt, that this is far from being an *expreſs* teſtimony, or, indeed, any teſtimony at all, in favour of Infant baptiſm; we may venture to conclude, that it is the *firſt* paſſage in eccleſiaſtical antiquity, which Dr. WALL conſidered as having any *appearance* of being directly to his purpoſe, and the *very beſt* he could find to ſupport his hypotheſis. But, is it not ſtrange, is it not quite unaccountable, that ſuch ambiguous words as thoſe of IRENÆUS ſhould be conſidered by our opponents, as the *moſt explicit* of any on record, in proof that Pædobaptiſm was practiſed ſo early as the year one hundred and eighty, if it had been a divine appointment and cuſtomary in the church from the apoſtolic times? What, is there nothing in thoſe monuments of antiquity, which go under the names of BARNABAS, of CLEMENS ROMANUS, of HERMAS, of IGNATIUS, and of POLYCARP, as much to the purpoſe as this paſſage of the celebrated biſhop of Lyons! Is there nothing in the writings of JUSTIN MARTYR, of ARTHENAGORAS, or of THEOPHYLUS ANTIOCHENUS, (which are all conſidered, by learned men, as prior to thoſe of IRENÆUS) that is equally plain and equally favourable to the antiquity of Pædobaptiſm! Strange, indeed, ſuppoſing Infant baptiſm to have been derived from the Apoſtles, and to have been generally practiſed in the times of thoſe authors; that none of them ſhould ſpeak with as much clearneſs and preciſion about it, as the venerable IRENÆUS in thoſe equivocal words before us!

Dr. WALL has alſo produced a paſſage from CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, who wrote a little before TERTULLIAN, by which he ſeems to think it

apparent, that the Alexandrian Catechiſt conſidered the Apoſtles as having baptized infants. The words of that ancient author, as quoted and rendered by Dr. WALL, are theſe: "If any one be by trade a fiſherman, he will do well to think of an Apoſtle, and the *children* taken out of the water*."—If, however, we would not be led by the ſound of theſe words, rather than their ſenſe, it ſeems neceſſary we ſhould advert to the *title* and *ſcope* of the work, in which the paſſage is found: concerning which, let us hear a learned Pædobaptiſt. DU PIN, when deſcribing the works of CLEMENT, and ſpeaking of that book from which the quotation is made, ſays; "The ſecond book, intitled, the *Pedagogue*, is a diſcourſe intirely of morality. It is divided into three books. In the firſt he ſhews, what it is to be a *Pedagogue*; that is to ſay, *a conductor*, *paſtor*, or *director of men*. He proves that this quality chiefly and properly belongs only to the Word incarnate. He ſays that it is the part of the *Pedagogue* to regulate the manners, conduct the actions, and cure the paſſions—That he equally informs men and women, the learned and the ignorant, becauſe all men ſtand in need of inſtruction, being all *children*, in one ſenſe. Yet, however, that we muſt not think that the doctrine of the Chriſtians is childiſh and contemptible; but that, on the contrary, the quality of *children*, which they receive in baptiſm, renders them perfect in the knowledge of divine things†."

From this account of the work we are naturally led to ſuppoſe, that CLEMENT, when addreſſing, or ſpeaking of, Chriſtian converts, would frequently call them *children:* and that this is a fact, appears by

* *Defence of Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Appendix, p. 8, 9.
† *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Writers*, Vol. I. p. 62, 63.

by thoſe extracts which Mr. BARKER has made from the book, which he ſeems to have carefully read with a view to this very particular. The general deſign of this ancient book, as conciſely repreſented by him, and part of his quotations from it, are as follow. "The catechiſt of Alexandria here deſcribes the perſons he was to teach, what they were to be taught, and how they were to be admitted into the church. *Pæd.* I. 5. 'Παιδαγωγια, inſtruction, is *guiding of children*, (παιδων αγωγη) as the name ſhews: it remains to ſee who the Scripture calls *children*; and then to ſet a maſter (παιδαγωγος) over them. We, then, are the *children*—who are in the ſtate of *diſciples*—*Unleſs ye be converted and become as theſe children, ye ſhall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*; not figuring a new birth, (αναγεννησις) but commending the innocence of children.—Repreſenting the innocence of the mind by childhood, he calls us *children*, (παιδας) *young*, *little ones*, (νηπιους) ſons,—and a new people—He figuratively calls us *young ones*, who are not enſlaved to ſin,—pure, leaping to the Father only,—running to the truth, and ſwift to ſalvation;—ſuch—our divine Guide of the young (πωλοδαμνης) takes care of—The Lord plainly ſhews who are meant by *children*; when a queſtion aroſe among the Apoſtles, *which of them ſhould be the greateſt*; Jeſus ſet a child among them, ſaying, *Whoever ſhall humble himſelf as this child, the ſame is greateſt in the kingdom of heaven*—Thoſe are truly children, *who know God only* as their father; are pure, meek, (νηπιοι) and ſincere—He commands us to be without care of things here,—and cleave only to the Father:—he who fulfils this command, is truly a *little one*, (νηπιος) and a child (παις) of God—The Lord is called a *perfect man*,

as

as being perfect in righteousness;—but we are *little ones* (νηπιοι) perfected (τελειουμεθα) when we become of the church, and receive Christ as our head.—A person is not called νηπιος, because foolish,—but as meek and mild (νηπιος, ηπιος)—a little one is meek,—without guile,—which is the foundation of truth:—the new minds of little ones were once foolish, now newly wise.—He calls the Lord himself a *child*,—shall not the instruction of this child be perfect,—who guides us *children* (παιδας) who are his *little ones* (νηπιους.)'

"Far from confining the words, παιδες and νηπιοι, to infants, he [CLEMENT] calls all *children*, which he as a teacher (παιδαγωγος) is to instruct; as having before been ignorant, now become sensible, yet still meek, teachable, and unprejudiced; judging it the perfection of a man to imitate the innocence and teachableness of children. But those who are in a course of instruction for baptism, are what he especially calls *children* (παιδες and νηπιοι;) for when baptized they become *perfect*, τελειοι.—*Pæd.* III. 10. 'The Lord taught his disciples to catch men, as *fishes* out of the water.—*Pæd.* III. 11. If any be a fisher, let him remember the Apostle, and the *children* (παιδιων) drawn out of the water.'—Those are baptized, who believe and seek Christ, the *children* (νηπιοι and παιδια) here said to be baptized, which WALL supposes to be infants, are, as appears above, *all* of whatever age, who being meek and teachable seek Christ the true teacher ('ο παιδαγωγος) and submit to him*."

It is worthy of remark, that the frequent use of these familiar

* *Duty and Benefits of Bap.* p. 73, 74, 75. *Note:* The Edition of CLEMENT's *Works*, from which the quotations are made, is that of Dr. POTTER, p. 104. 106—109. 112. 285. 289.

familiar terms, *children* and *little children*, here applied by CLEMENT to ſuch as were under a courſe of inſtruction, of whatever age they might be; ſeems to have been derived from the example of Paul and of John, in their Epiſtles. For the words, νηπιοι and παιδια, ſo frequently uſed by the Alexandrian Catechiſt, are applied by thoſe Apoſtles, in various places, to young or feeble converts. See 1 Cor. iii. 1. Epheſ. iv. 14. Heb. v. 13. 1 John ii. 13, 18. The term τεκνια, *little children*, is alſo abundantly uſed in the ſame acceptation. See Gal. iv. 19. 1 John ii. 1, 12, 28. and iii. 7, 18. and iv. 4. and v. 21. See alſo, Matt. xi. 25. Luke x. 21.—And ſo the word παιδαγωγους, *pædagogues*, *inſtructors of children*, is uſed by Paul for ſuch as ſucceeded him in preaching the goſpel among the Corinthians. See 1 Cor. iv. 15. —To which I may add an obſervation of the learned Mr. BINGHAM, which is as follows: "The Chriſtians were wont to pleaſe themſelves with the artificial name *Piſciculi*, *fiſhes*; to denote, as TERTULLIAN [who was cotemporary with CLEMENT] words it, that they were regenerate, or born again into Chriſt's religion by water, and could not be ſaved but by continuing therein. And this name was the rather choſen by them, becauſe the initial letters of our Saviour's names and titles in Greek, Ιησους Χριστος, Θεου Υιος, Σωτηρ, JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, OUR SAVIOUR, technically put together, make up the name ΙΧΘΥΣ; which ſignifies a *fiſh*, and is alluded to both by TERTULLIAN and OPTATUS*." —While it appears, therefore, that the *title*, the *phraſeology*, and the *deſign* of CLEMENT's performance, unite in leading us to conſider the term παιδιων, as expreſſive of *young converts* to Chriſtianity, and not of *infants*; there cannot be the leaſt ground for concluding, that the celebrated Catechiſt had any thought of

* *Origines Eccleſ.* B. I. Chap. I. § 2.

of *Infant* baptiſm, when he ſpake of "παιδων, *children*, drawn out of the water;" but of ſolemnly immerſing ſuch as had been *inſtructed* in the doctrine of Chriſt. And, indeed, as Dr. WALL is the only one of our learned opponents, whom I have obſerved, that has produced the paſſage againſt us in the courſe of this controverſy; there is reaſon to think, that few of them ever conſidered it as proving any thing at all in their favour.

REFLECT. III. As I humbly conceive it muſt be allowed by all competent and impartial judges, that TERTULLIAN is the *firſt* author who ſpeaks expreſſly of Infant baptiſm; and as it is equally clear that he *oppoſes* it; ſo, we may juſtly preſume, it was then a *novel* practice, was *juſt* commencing, and approved by *very few*. Had it been otherwiſe, there is no reaſon to imagine that the celebrated African Father would have treated it as he did; not only becauſe he was very tenacious of eccleſiaſtical traditions, as VENEMA has well obſerved, No. 10; but alſo becauſe he mentions with approbation various religious rites, as practiſed by the church, which, in his own view, had no pretence to Scripture authority. His oppoſition to Infant baptiſm is expreſſed in the following manner. "What neceſſity is there to expoſe godfathers to the hazard of anſwering for thoſe whom they hold at the fonts? ſince they may be prevented by death from being able to perform thoſe promiſes, which they have made for the children, or elſe may be diſappointed by their evil inclinations. Jeſus Chriſt ſays, indeed, *Hinder not little children from coming to me*; but that they ſhould come to him as ſoon as they are *advanced in years*, as ſoon as they have *learnt their religion*, when they may be *taught whither they are going*, when they are

become

become Chriſtians, when they begin *to be able to know Jeſus Chriſt*. What is there that ſhould compel this innocent age to receive baptiſm? And ſince they are not yet allowed the diſpoſal of temporal goods, is it reaſonable that they ſhould be intruſted with the concerns of heaven?—Thoſe who ſhall duly conſider the great weight and moment of this divine ſacrament, will rather be afraid of making too much haſte to receive it, than to defer it for ſome time, that ſo they may be the better capable of receiving it more worthily *." The treatiſe of TERTULLIAN, *de Baptiſmo*, from which this is extracted and tranſlated by DU PIN, is ſuppoſed, by learned men, to have been written about the year two hundred and four†. And again he ſays; "Baptiſm is the ſeal of *faith*; which faith is begun and adorned by the faith of repentance. We are not therefore waſhed that we may leave off ſinning, but becauſe we have *already done it*, and are *already purified in heart* ‡." Sentiments and aſſertions theſe, that cannot be reconciled with the baptiſm of infants.

That this ancient writer had a high regard for traditional rites in the affairs of religion, is plain beyond a doubt, from what he ſays when profeſſedly handling that very ſubject. His words, as given us by an eminent Pædobaptiſt, are as follow. "Let us try, then, whether no tradition ought to be allowed that is not written; and I ſhall freely grant that this need not to be allowed, if the contrary be not evinced by the examples of ſeveral other cuſtoms, which without the authority of any ſcripture are approved, only on the account that they were firſt delivered,

* In DU PIN's *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Writers*, Cent. III. p. 80. Edit. 2d. † Vid. J. FABRICIUM, *Hiſt. Biblioth. Fabrician.* Tom. I. p. 157. ‡ *Opera, De Poenitentia*, p. 144. Lutet. 1634.

delivered, and have ever ſince been uſed. Now to begin with baptiſm—When we are taken up out of the water, we *taſte a mixture of milk and honey*; and from that day we abſtain a whole week from bathing ourſelves, which otherwiſe we uſe every day. The ſacrament of the euchariſt, which our Lord celebrated at meal time, and ordered all to take, we receive in our aſſemblies *before day*; and never but from the hands of the paſtor. We give oblations every year for (or in commemoration of) *the dead*, on the day of their martyrdom—At every ſetting out, or entry on buſineſs; whenever we come in, or go out from any place; when we dreſs for a journey; when we go into a bath; when we go to meat; when the candles are brought in; when we lie down, or ſit down; and whatever buſineſs we have, *we make on our foreheads the ſign of the croſs*. If you ſearch in the Scriptures for any command for theſe and ſuch like uſages, you ſhall find none. *Tradition* will be urged to you, as the ground of them; *cuſtom*, as the confirmer of them; and our *religion* teaches to obſerve them *."—Hence it appears with ſuperior evidence, that this ancient Author conſidered Infant baptiſm as a *novel* invention—as a practice, that was neither *injoined* by divine command, nor *warranted* by apoſtolic examples, nor yet *recommended* by the poor pretence of tradition, nor even *countenanced* by prevailing cuſtom. While, it is very obſervable, tradition and cuſtom are actually pleaded by him, in favour of certain rites (and one of them an appendage of baptiſm) which Proteſtants have generally agreed to reject, as manifeſtly ſuperſtitious.

It ſeems apparent alſo, from TURTULLIAN, that the

* In Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 480, 481.

the uſe of *ſponſors* is of as high antiquity as the practice of *Infant* baptiſm. For, as this famous African Father is the firſt that expreſſly mentions the former; ſo, DEYLINGIUS tells us that he is the firſt who ſays any thing about the *latter* *: with whom Mr. TOWGOOD agrees †. Of theſe ſponſors, DEYLINGIUS informs us, there were three ſorts; namely, for infants, who could not anſwer for themſelves, by reaſon of their *tender age*; for ſuch adults, as were incapable of anſwering, on account of *great affliction*; and for *all adults* in general ‡. Nor have we ſufficient reaſon to ſuppoſe, that ſponſors were firſt uſed at the adminiſtration of *Pædobaptiſm:* no, the learned MOSHEIM is expreſs to the contrary. His words are theſe: "Adult perſons were prepared for baptiſm by abſtinence, prayer, and other pious exerciſes. It was to anſwer for *them* that ſponſors, or godfathers, were *firſt* inſtituted, though they were afterwards admitted alſo in the baptiſm of infants §." Sponſors were uſed for adults in the following ages alſo, as learned writers inform us ‖. And, as to infants, Dr. WALL aſſures us, "There is no time, or age, of the church, in which there is any *appearance* that infants were ordinarily baptized without ſponſors, or godfathers **."

The Baptiſts have often been charged with *Anabaptiſm*; a ſentiment and practice which they deteſt, as much as any of their oppoſers. It may be obſerved,

* *De Paſtoral. Prudentia*, Pars III. C. III. §. 29.
† *Diſſent. Gent. Letters*, Lett. II. p. 6. ‡ DEYLING. *ut ſupra*, and BINGHAM's *Orig. Eccleſ.* B. XI. Chap. 8.
§ *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt.* Vol. I. p. 171, 172. ‖ *Magdeb. Centur.* Cent. VII. C. VI. p. 73. FOX's *Acts and Mon.* Vol. I. A. D. 636. p. 123. FORBESII *Inſtruct. Hiſt. Theolog.* L. X. C. V. § 22. ** *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. IX. p. 477.

ſerved, however, that, were they inclined to vindicate Anabaptiſm, TERTULLIAN might be challenged as an evidence of its high antiquity. For though he ſays, there is but one baptiſm, and that it ſhould not be repeated; yet he excepts the baptiſm of heretics, "who, he adds, are not able to give it, becauſe they have it not: and therefore it is, that we have a rule among us to *rebaptize* them *."

REFLECT. IV. It is common for our opponents, when defending the antiquity of Infant baptiſm, to produce various paſſages from ORIGEN, who flouriſhed in the former part of the third century; ſome of which paſſages, it muſt be allowed, are plain and expreſs to the point. It ought, however, to be obſerved, that thoſe quotations are made, not from the Greek of that celebrated Father, but from ſuch Latin verſions of his works as are very corrupt, and conſequently render it quite uncertain what was his opinion in reference to that affair. That the works of ORIGEN have been greatly injured by his tranſlators, the moſt learned Pædobaptiſts declare. GROTIUS, for inſtance, when ſpeaking of that celebrated ancient, with regard to Infant baptiſm, ſays: "Some things aſcribed to him, were penned by un *uncertain* author; and ſome things are *interpolated*." And, again; "What ORIGEN thought about the final puniſhment of the wicked, is difficult, from his writings, to be aſſerted; *all things* are ſo interpolated by RUFFINUS †." The MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS inform us, that ORIGEN's Homilies on Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, "were tranſlated by RUFFINUS; who rather *altered* and *corrupted*, than faithfully tranſlated, as ERASMUS intimates in the cenſure

* In DU PIN's *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Writers*, Cent. III. p. 80.

† Apud POLI *Synopſ.* ad Mat. xix. 14. xxv. 46.

ſure he paſſed upon them *." SCULTETUS aſſerts, "That RUFFINUS, the tranſlator of many of ORIGEN's books, uſed ſo great a liberty, that he *retrenched*, *added*, and *altered*, ſuch things as appeared to him neceſſary to be caſhiered, added, or changed. So that the reader is often uncertain, whether he peruſe ORIGEN or RUFFINUS; ſeeing the Greek works of ORIGEN are not now extant, by which the Latin verſion might be corrected and amended †." VOSSIUS, having produced a paſſage from ORIGEN's Homilies on the Romans, in favour of Infant baptiſm, adds: "But, concerning ORIGEN, we ſay the leſs, becauſe the things which might be quoted are not extant in the Greek ‡." The learned VITRINGA, when handling the ſame ſubject, makes a ſimilar acknowledgement, and blames RUFFINUS §." M. DAILLE is very explicit on this point. His language is; "Certainly RUFFINUS—hath ſo *filthily mangled*, and ſo *licentiouſly confounded* the writings of ORIGEN, EUSEBIUS, and others, which he hath tranſlated into Latin; that you will hardly find a page, in his tranſlations, where he hath not either cut off, or added, or at leaſt altered ſomething ||." DU PIN ſays, "We have none of the Scholia [written by ORIGEN] remaining, nor have we hardly any of the Homilies in Greek; and thoſe which we have in Latin, are tranſlated by RUFFINUS and others with ſo much liberty, that it is a difficult matter to diſcern what is ORIGEN's own, from what has been foiſted in by the interpreter—The liberty which RUFFINUS has given himſelf is ſtill more evident, by what he has written

* *Cent.* III. C. X. p. 180. † *Medull. Theolog. Patrum*, p. 124. Francf. 1634. ‡ *Theſ. Theolog.* de Pædobap. Pars II. Theſ. VIII. p. 433. § *Obſ. ſac.* L. II. C. VI. § 9. || *Right Uſe of the Fathers*, Book I. Chap. IV. p. 40, 41.

written in the prologue to his verſion to the Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the Romans; which, he ſays, he has abridged by above the half. S. HIEROM's verſions are *not more exact*; and the moſt faulty of all is that of an ancient tranſlator, who has interpreted the Commentaries upon S. Matthew—Having only the verſion of the greateſt part of the Homilies, we cannot be certain whether that which relates to doctrine and diſcipline, be ORIGEN's own, or RUFFINUS's *." Mr. WESTON, ſpeaking of RUFFINUS, as a tranſlator of EUSEBIUS, paſſes the following ſevere cenſure upon him. He "hath ventured on downright *forgery*, and pretended to tranſlate from EUSEBIUS what EUSEBIUS never wrote †." HUETIUS, when ſpeaking of ORIGEN's remains in general, has the following remark. "They are very imperfect and much abuſed, or elſe changed and deformed by *abominable tranſlations* ‡." RIVETUS, when ſpeaking of a certain work that goes under the name of ORIGEN, ſays; "Concerning the Homilies on various paſſages in the Goſpel according to Matthew, it appears to ERASMUS that they are not ORIGEN's; but were penned by ſome Latin author, the remains of which have been *impudently corrupted* by RUFFINUS §." And CHAMIER ſays, "All the learned know, that RUFFINUS uſed but *little integrity* in tranſlating authors ||."

Such, in the opinion of the beſt judges, being the character

* *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Writ.* Cent. III. p. 100, 107. † *Inquiry into Reject. Chriſt. Miracles*, p. 209. ‡ In Dr. GALE's *Reflect.* p. 522. § *Critici Sacri*, L. II. C. XIII. p. 205. || In Mr. TOMBES's *Antipæd.* Part III. p. 764. See alſo, Mr. CLARKSON *on Liturgies*, p. 141. J. FABRICII *Hiſt. Biblioth. Fabrician.* Tom I. p. 85, 86. VENEMÆ *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Secul. III. § 3.

character of ORIGEN's tranſlators, we have ſufficient reaſon to except againſt all teſtimonies produced from the ancient verſions of his writings, in favour of Pædobaptiſm. And, indeed, were there not a great poverty of evidence, in ſupport of that practice, for about two hundred and fifty years; it is hardly to be ſuppoſed, that our Brethren would ever ſubpœna witneſſes whoſe veracity is thus impeached, in order to prove any part of their hypotheſis. We have reaſon alſo to wonder at the inadvertency of Mr. ADDINGTON; who, ſpeaking of RUFFINUS, tells us, that he "lived in the THIRD century:" and that his "*knowledge* or INTEGRITY HAVE NEVER BEEN DOUBTED *." Palpable, groſs miſtakes!

There is, however, one paſſage in the Greek of ORIGEN, ſometimes quoted by our opponents; and it is this, as produced and rendered by Dr. WALL. "One may inquire, When it is that the angels here ſpoken of are ſet over thoſe little ones, ſhewed, or ſignified, by our Saviour? Whether they take the care and management of them from the time when they by the waſhing of regeneration, whereby they were new born, do, *as new born babes* DESIRE THE SINCERE MILK OF THE WORD, and are no longer ſubject to any evil power? Or from their birth, according to the foreknowledge of God and his predeſtinating of them? and ſo on †." That the perſons here intended, by ORIGEN, were not *infants* in a literal ſenſe, but ſuch as were *newly born again*; is plain from his deſcribing them, in the language of inſpiration, as *deſiring the ſincere milk of the word*. Dr. WALL, therefore, might well acknowledge, that the latter part of the paſſage does "very much puzzle the

* *Chriſtian Min. Reaſons*, p. 163.

† *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part I. p. 33.

the cauſe," for which Pædobaptiſts produce the quotation; "and make it doubtful whether ORIGEN be to be there underſtood, of infants in *age*, or of ſuch Chriſtian men as are endued with the innocence and ſimplicity of infants *." If, indeed, the language of this learned Ancient had been, as it is *partially* repreſented by Sir PETER KING, of which Dr. WALL intimates his diſapprobation †; or if the repreſentation of it which Mr. ADDINGTON has lately given, had been candid and fair‡; it would have been clearly in favour of Pædobaptiſm. But, as that is not the caſe, we may venture to affirm, that no ſubſtantial evidence for Infant baptiſm, in the time of ORIGEN, has been yet produced; and that there is no *proof* of its being a common practice, for two centuries and a half after the Chriſtian æra commenced. To indulge *conjectures* of its being far more ancient, is to imitate the conduct of BELLARMINE, who ſays, concerning another affair; "Although there is no *expreſs* teſtimony amongſt the Ancients, to prove that they at any time offered ſacrifice without ſome one or more communicating with the prieſts; yet it may be gathered by *conjecture* §."

REFLECT. V. As it appears from this and the preceding Chapter, that the New Teſtament contains neither expreſs precept nor plain example of Infant baptiſm, and that no ſubſtantial evidence can be produced from eccleſiaſtical authors of its being a prevailing cuſtom, till about the middle of the third century; we may with great propriety (mutatis mutandis) adopt and apply to Pædobaptiſm, the reaſonings of Proteſtants againſt the peculiarities of Popery.

* *Idem*, p. 32, 33. † *Inquiry into Conſtitut. of Prim. Church*, Part II. p. 46. ‡ *Chriſt. Min. Reaſ.* p. 162.
§ In *Popery Confuted by Papiſts*, p. 81.

Popery. The following may ſerve as a ſpecimen, TURRETTINE, when oppoſing the ſuperſtitious appendages of baptiſm, as practiſed in the Papal communion; argues, not only from the ſilence of *Scripture*, but alſo from that "of the *moſt ancient Chriſtian writers*. Becauſe, in the genuine books of undoubted and pure antiquity, nothing occurs relating to thoſe things—Whence, he adds, there is no reaſon for us to imagine that they were uſed in thoſe firſt times. Nay, a ſolid argument is thence drawn, that no ſuch things were then practiſed: becauſe it *cannot be doubted*, had they been then in uſe, but the Fathers would have mentioned them; like as, in the following ages, they were not ſilent about things that were frequently added to the legitimate and apoſtolic rite of baptiſm*"—Mr. NEALE, when oppoſing the ſupremacy of the Roman Pontiff, ſays; "Had our Lord appointed a vicar-general on earth, we might expect to meet, not only with his *name* in Scripture, but with the *time* and *manner* of his inſtalment, and with the *deed of conveyance* to his ſucceſſors, in the *moſt plain* and *ſignificant* words; or, at leaſt, that it ſhould be read in *every page of antiquity*. But if the moſt ancient Fathers of the church conſent in any thing, it is in a *general ſilence* about this matter. The whole ſtreſs of the evidence is therefore laid upon—*obſcure* and *metaphorical paſſages* of Scripture. —If we lay theſe things together, and conſider the *ſilence* of the Scripture records and genuine remains of antiquity, about a ſupreme viſible head,—it will amount to *a demonſtration*, that the hierarchy of the church of Rome is built upon the ſand †."—"There is ſcarce any thing, ſays Dr. HARRIS, in which the church

* *Inſtitut.* Loc. XIX. Q. XVIII. § 6. † *Serm. at Salter's Hall, on Suprem. of Biſhop of Rome*, p. 9. 30.

church of Rome puts in a ſtronger claim, or makes a louder boaſt, than the *ſenſe* of antiquity and the *judgement* of the ancient Fathers; though, in points peculiar to Popery, and in which they differ from the Proteſtants, ſcarce any thing is leſs fair, or more unjuſt*."—"If antiquity, ſays Dr. HUGHES, be of any conſequence in determining matters of religion, the *earlieſt* muſt be the *beſt*: and this is clearly againſt the church of Rome, in the affair now before us†." —The ſubſtance of this reaſoning may be thus expreſſed and applied to our preſent purpoſe. The baptiſm of infants, for which our Brethren contend, is not mentioned in Scripture. They are obliged, therefore, to lay the whole ſtreſs of their argument on *obſcure* and *metaphorical* paſſages of ſacred Writ. But, had the matter in diſpute been appointed by Jeſus Chriſt and practiſed by the Apoſtles, there is reaſon to think the writers of the New Teſtament would have recorded it in a *clear* and *explicit* manner. Conſequently, it is *unreaſonable* to believe, or practiſe, any ſuch thing.—Again: The earlieſt Chriſtian antiquity muſt be the *beſt*. But Pædobaptiſm does *not occur* in the genuine writings of the higheſt and pureſt antiquity. It cannot be doubted, however, that, if it had been known and practiſed in thoſe times, the Fathers would have *mentioned* it, as well as other things of much leſs importance. We have, therefore, abundant reaſon to conclude, that thoſe ancient Authors knew nothing of it.—Now if theſe principles and this courſe of arguing be pertinent and concluſive, in oppoſition to ſuch religious rites in the Church of Rome, as are not mentioned in the Scripture, nor in primitive antiquity; what reaſon can be aſſigned why they ſhould not

* *Serm. at Salter's Hall, on Tranſubſtan.* p. 31.

† *Serm. at Salter's Hall, on Venerat. of Saints*, p. 30, 31.

not have equal force againſt Infant baptiſm? For it is manifeſt, that all their force ariſes, not from an application of them to the religious cuſtoms of a *particular people*; but from thoſe religious cuſtoms not being mentioned in the *divine Word*, nor in the genuine writings of the *moſt venerable antiquity*.

REFLECT. VI. Though the practice of Infant baptiſm did prevail in the latter part of the third century, yet learned Pædobaptiſts themſelves inform us, that many eminent perſons, deſcended from Chriſtian parents in following times, were not baptized till they arrived at the age of maturity. Bp. TAYLOR ſays; "The *wiſeſt* of our Fathers in Chriſt did not come unto baptiſm, until they were come to *a ſtrong and confirmed wit and age*—There is *no pretence* of tradition, that the church in all ages did baptize all the infants of Chriſtian parents. It is more certain that they did not do it always, than that they did it in the firſt age. St. AMBROSE, St. HIEROM, and St. AUSTIN, were born of Chriſtian parents, and yet not baptized until the full age of a man, and more*." M. DAILLE bears the following teſtimony: "In ancient times they *often* deferred the baptizing both of infants and of other people, as appears by the hiſtory of the Emperors, CONSTANTINE the Great, of CONSTANTIUS, of THEODOSIUS, of VALENTINIAN, and of GRATIAN, in St. AMBROSE; and alſo by the Orations and Homilies of GREGORY NAZIANZENE, and of St. BASIL, upon this ſubject. And ſome of the Fathers too have been of opinion, that it is fit it ſhould be deferred; as, namely, TERTULLIAN, as we have formerly noted of him†." The famous AUSTIN, in his Confeſſions, having

* In Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. II. § 10.
† *Right Uſe of the Fathers*, Book II. Chap. VI. p. 149.

ſaid; "I was then ſigned with the ſign of his [Chriſt's] croſs, and was ſeaſoned with his ſalt, ſo ſoon as I came out of my mother's womb, who greatly truſted in thee;" his tranſlator, Dr. WILLIAM WATS, has the following Note upon it: "This was the practice of the primitive times; by which religious parents devoted their children unto Chriſt, *long before* their baptiſm, which in *thoſe days was deferred till they were able to anſwer for themſelves**." GREGORY NAZIANZEN, born in the year three hundred and eighteen, whoſe parents were Chriſtians, and his father a biſhop, was not baptized till about thirty years of age†; and CHRYSOSTOM alſo, born of Chriſtian parents, in the year three hundred and forty ſeven, was not baptized till near twenty one years of age‡. See the immediately following Chapter, No 1.—Now, if the parents of theſe Chriſtian Fathers and Cæſars, though profeſſing themſelves the diſciples of Chriſt, did not baptize their infant offſpring; we may juſtly preſume, whatever might be the reaſons of their conduct, that many others in thoſe times were influenced by the ſame reaſons and acted a ſimilar part.

The language of BONIFACE, biſhop of Theſſalonica, in a letter to AUSTIN, is far from expreſſing a warm regard, either for Infant baptiſm, or the buſineſs of ſponſors. "Suppoſe I ſet before you an infant, ſays he to AUSTIN, and aſk you, *Whether, when he grows up, he will be a chaſte perſon?* or, *Whether he will be a thief?* You, doubtleſs, will anſwer, *I do not know.* And, *Whether he, in that infant age,*

* AUSTIN's *Confeſſions*, Book I. Chap. XI. p. 17. Edit. 1650. † DU PIN, *Cent.* IV. p. 159. *Gen. Biog. Dict.* Art. GREG. NAZ. ‡ GROTIUS, apud POLI *Synopſ.* ad Mat. xix. 14. DU PIN's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Cent. V. p. 6, 7.

age, have any thought, good, or evil? You will ſtill ſay, *I do not know.* If, then, you dare not aſſert any thing concerning either his future conduct, or his preſent thoughts; what is the reaſon that, when they are preſented for baptiſm, their parents, as ſponſors for them, anſwer and ſay; They *do* that, of which their infant age is not able to *think*; or if it can, it is a profound ſecret? For we aſk thoſe by whom they are preſented, and ſay; *Does he believe in God?* (which queſtion concerns that age which is ignorant whether there be a God.) They anſwer, *He does believe.* And ſo, likewiſe, an anſwer is returned to all the reſt. Whence I wonder that parents, in theſe affairs, anſwer ſo confidently for the child, that he does ſo many good things, which, at the time of his baptiſm, the adminiſtrator demands! And yet, were I at that very time to aſk; *Will this baptized child,* when grown to maturity, *be chaſte?* or, *Will he not be a thief?* I know not whether any one would venture to anſwer, *He will*; or, *He will not*, be the one or the other; as they anſwer without heſitation, *He believes in God—He turns to God**."—Hence it appears, That, in the time of AUSTIN, *a profeſſion of faith* was always required, prior to the adminiſtration of baptiſm, agreeably to the primitive pattern, Acts viii. 37—That, when an *infant* was preſented for baptiſm, this profeſſion was made by *proxy*; as it is now in the church of Rome and in the church of England—That BONIFACE conſidered this vicarious profeſſion, as a *bold, unwarrantable, abſurd,* procedure; as it undoubtedly is—And, conſequently, that he was far from being, like AUSTIN, a ſanguine admirer of Pædobaptiſm; there being, as Dr. WALL obſerves, "no time or age of the church, in which there

* AUGUSTINI *Epiſtola* ad BONIFACIUM, Epiſt. XXIII.

there is *any appearance* that infants were ordinarily baptized, without ſponſors or godfathers*," to make that vicarious profeſſion, againſt which BONIFACE with ſo much reaſon and force objects.

Now, to theſe difficulties the celebrated biſhop of HYPPO, among other trifling and impertinent things, replies: "As the ſacrament of Chriſt's body, is, after a certain faſhion, Chriſt's body; and the ſacrament of Chriſt's blood, is his blood; ſo the ſacrament of faith, is faith; and to believe, is nothing elſe, but to have faith. And ſo, when an infant, that has not yet the faculty of faith, is ſaid to believe; he is ſaid to have faith, becauſe of the ſacrament of faith: and to turn to God, becauſe of the ſacrament of converſion; becauſe that anſwer belongs to the celebration of the ſacrament—An infant, though he be not yet conſtituted a believer, by that faith which conſiſts in the will of believers; yet he is by the ſacrament of that faith. For as he is ſaid to believe, ſo he is called a believer; not from his having the thing itſelf in his mind, but from his receiving the ſacrament of it. And when a perſon begins to have a ſenſe of things, he does not repeat that ſacrament, but he underſtands the force of it, and by conſent of will ſquares himſelf to the true meaning of it. And till he can do this, the ſacrament will avail to his preſervation againſt all contrary powers: and ſo far it will avail, that, if he depart this life before the uſe of reaſon, he will by this Chriſtian remedy of the ſacrament itſelf (the charity of the church recommending him) be made free from that condemnation, which, by one man, entered into the world. He that does not believe this, and thinks it cannot be done, is indeed an infidel, though he have the ſacrament of faith: and that

* *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 477.

that infant is much better, who, though he have not faith in his mind, yet puts no bar of a contrary mind againſt it, and ſo receives the ſacrament to his ſoul's health*." Such is the ſolution given by the venerable AUSTIN. How far any of thoſe who now adminiſter baptiſm on the creed of a *proxy*, whether latent in the parent, or avowed by the ſponſor, may approve of his reaſoning, I cannot pretend to ſay: but I think it is plain, that the New Teſtament is equally ſilent about a vicarious *faith* and a vicarious *baptiſm*. He, therefore, who admits the *former*, could not conſiſtently oppoſe the *latter*, were any to plead for it.

CHAP. X.

The HIGH OPINION *of the Fathers, concerning the Utility of Baptiſm, and the* GROUNDS *on which they proceeded in adminiſtering that Ordinance to Infants, when Pædobaptiſm became a prevailing Practice.*

VITRINGA: "The ancient Chriſtian church, from the higheſt antiquity after the Apoſtolic times, appears generally to have thought, that baptiſm is *abſolutely neceſſary* for all that would be ſaved by the grace of Jeſus Chriſt. It was, therefore, cuſtomary in the ancient church, if infants were greatly afflicted and in danger of death; or if parents were affected with a ſingular concern about the ſalvation of their children; to preſent their infants, or children in their minority, to the biſhop to be baptized. But if theſe reaſons did not urge them, they thought it better, and

* In Dr. WALL, *ut ſupra*, p. 115.

and more for the intereſt of minors, that their baptiſm ſhould be deferred till they arrived at a more advanced age: which cuſtom was not yet aboliſhed in the time of AUSTIN, though he vehemently urged the neceſſity of baptiſm, while, with all his might, he defended the doctrines of grace againſt PELAGIUS." *Obſervat. Sac.* Tom. I. L. II. C. VI. § 9.

2. VENEMA: "The ancients connected *a regenerating power*, and *a communication of the Spirit*, with baptiſm. JUSTIN MARTYR (*Apol.* II. 79.) aſſerts it in expreſs words; and to baptiſm he applies that ſaying of our Lord, Joh. iii. 5. *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* Beſides, (*contra* TRYPH. p. 231.) he aſſerts, *That baptiſm only can cleanſe and purify a penitent*; where it is alſo called, *the water of life*—IRENÆUS (*adverſ. Hæreſ.* III. 17.) ſays, *That Chriſt gave to his diſciples the power of regenerating to God*, when he ſent them to baptize—And CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (*Pædag.* I. 6.) ſays; *Being dipped*, or baptized, *we are illuminated*; *being illuminated, we are adopted for ſons*; *being adopted, we are perfected*; *being perfected, we are rendered immortal:* whence baptiſm is called, *grace*, *illumination*, and *the perfect laver*, which words he there explains—The doctrine of TERTULLIAN is of a ſimilar kind. Thus he ſpeaks, (*de Pœnit.* C. VI.) *A divine benefit, that is, the abolition of offences, is aſcertained to thoſe that are about to enter the water*; yet only in reſpect of ſuch as repent. In his book concerning baptiſm, he explains his opinion more at large, and he there attributes to the water, by an union with the divine virtue, *a ſanctifying power*——That baptiſm is connected with the *remiſſion of antecedent ſins* and confers *a ſanctifying power* on the perſon baptized, is the undoubted opinion of CYPRIAN,

CYPRIAN, which he every where inculcates, ſo that there is hardly any need to produce the particular paſſages. In his firſt Epiſtle to DONATUS he declares, that before his converſion itſeemed impoſſible to him, *that a perſon ſhould all on a ſudden put off ſin, in the laver of the ſalutary water*, which he himſelf had experienced; ſaying, *Afterwards, by the help of the generating water, the ſpots of the former time are cleanſed away; a ſerene and a pure light from above, infuſes itſelf into the peaceful breaſt; afterwards, a ſecond birth, the Spirit being drawn from heaven, reſtored me into a new man*——In his LXIII Epiſtle to COECILIUS, ——he expreſſly ſays, *By baptiſm the Holy Spirit is received.* In his LXX Epiſtle, to JANUARIUS, he ſays; *It is neceſſary, therefore, that the water ſhould be firſt purified and ſanctified by the prieſt, that he may be able by the baptiſm which he adminiſters, to waſh away the ſins of a man who is baptized*; where alſo many other things of a ſimilar kind occur. In his LXXI Epiſtle, to QUINTUS, he ſays; *There is one water in the holy church, which maketh ſheep.* In his LXXII Epiſtle, to STEPHANUS, he applies what our Lord ſays, Joh. iii. concerning the neceſſity of regeneration, to *baptiſm.* In his LXXIII Epiſtle, to JUBAIANUS, theſe remarkable words occur; *Thence begins the origin of all faith, the ſaving entrance to a hope of eternal life, and a divine grant to purify and quicken the ſervants of God:* ſoon after, he alſo attributes the remiſſion of ſin, and ſanctification, to baptiſm, and applies to it Joh. iii. 5. In his LXXIV Epiſtle, to POMPEJUS, he ſays; *We are born, in Chriſt, by the laver of generation. Water only, cannot purge away ſins, and ſanctify a man, unleſs it have alſo the Holy Spirit. It is baptiſm, in which the old man dies, and the new man is born.* FIRMILIANUS alſo, in the LXXV Epiſtle, to CYPRIAN,

PRIAN, among the effects of baptiſm particularly mentions, *waſhing away the filth of the old man; forgiving of old ſins, that were deſerving of death; making perſons, by a heavenly regeneration, the ſons of God; and a reſtoration to life eternal, by the ſanctification of the divine laver*——GREGORY NAZIANZEN declares, (*Orat.* XL. p. 653.) That they who die unbaptized, without their own fault, go neither to heaven, nor hell; but if they have lived piouſly, to a middle place." *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. III. Secul. II. § 124. Sec. III. § 61. Tom. IV. Sec. IV. § 115.

3. SALMASIUS: "An opinion prevailed, that no one could be ſaved, without being baptized; and, for that reaſon, a cuſtom aroſe of baptizing infants." *Epiſt.* ad JUSTUM PACIUM, apud VAN DALE *Hiſt. Baptiſm.*

4. HOSPINIANUS: "AUSTIN,——when writing againſt the Pelagians, too inconſiderately conſigns over the infants of Chriſtians to damnation, that died without baptiſm. There is nothing that he more zealouſly urges, nor any thing on which he more firmly depends, than thoſe words of Chriſt; *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*" *Hiſt. Sacram.* L. II. C. II. p. 52.

5. SUICERUS: "We cannot deny, that many of the Ancients maintained the *abſolute neceſſity* of baptiſm. CHRYSOSTOM ſays, *It is impoſſible, without baptiſm, to obtain the kingdom:* and, ſoon after, *It is impoſſible to be ſaved without it*——This opinion, concerning the abſolute neceſſity of baptiſm, aroſe from a wrong underſtanding of our Lord's words, Joh. iii. 5. *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven*——CHRYSOSTOM again ſays, *If an infant die without baptiſm, through the negligence of the preſbyter,*

preſbyter, woe to that preſbyter! but if, through the negligence of the parents, woe to the parents of that infant!" *Theſaur. Eccleſ.* Tom. I. p. 650. 3.

6. Dr. WALL: "If we except TERTULLIAN—VINCENTIUS [A. D. 419] is the *firſt* man upon record, that ever ſaid, *that children might be ſaved without baptiſm*; if by being ſaved, we mean going to heaven; for that many before him thought they would be in a ſtate without puniſhment, I have ſhewed before——*All* the ancient Chriſtians, without the exception of *one* man, do underſtand that rule of our Saviour, Joh. iii. 5. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, of baptiſm. I had occaſion in the firſt Part to bring a great many inſtances of their ſayings; where all that mention that text from JUSTIN MARTYR down to St. AUSTIN do ſo apply it, and many more might be brought. Neither did I ever ſee it otherwiſe applied in any ancient writer. I believe CALVIN was the firſt that ever denied this place to mean baptiſm." *Hiſt. of Inf. Bap.* Part I. Chap. XX. p 232, 233. Part II. Chap. VI. p. 354.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Though it is manifeſt, from the conceſſions and aſſertions of learned Pædobaptiſts in the preceding Chapter, that there is no evidence of Infant baptiſm before the time of TERTULLIAN, by whom it was oppoſed; yet, from theſe quotations it plainly appears, that both he and others before him ſpake of baptiſm in ſuch a manner, as had a natural tendency to introduce and promote Pædobaptiſm. When JUSTIN, for inſtance, had learned to call baptiſm *the water of life*, and to interpret

Joh. iii. 5. as relating to that inſtitution—when CLEMENT of Alexandria had aſcribed to it an *illuminating power*, and connected *adoption*, *perfection*, and *immortality*, with it—and when TERTULLIAN had pronounced it *a divine bleſſing*, which aſcertains the *abolition of ſin*, and is attended with a *ſanctifying energy*; it is no wonder, that, in the time of CYPRIAN, it ſhould be thought neceſſary for infants to be baptized, and that Pædobaptiſm ſhould become a prevailing practice. The language of this venerable African, is like that of RUPERT, in the twelfth century, who ſays: "Baptiſm is therefore called *Tinctio*, in Latin, becauſe a man, when baptized, is, by the Spirit of grace, altered for the better, and is rendered very different from what he was before. He was a ſon of death, and of perdition; he is made a child of life and of acquiſition. He was a ſon of hell; he is made an heir of God's kingdom. He was an enemy of God; he is renconciled and made a child of God*." A pernicious opinion this, by whomſoever eſpouſed!

It is worthy of obſervation, that, while CYPRIAN ſtands forth as the firſt patron of *Infant Sprinkling*, he appears alſo as giving the ſanction of his authority, in favour of *holy water*; aſſerting the neceſſity of having the baptiſmal element *conſecrated* by a prieſt, in order to render it more effectual for the waſhing away of ſin. See No 2.——AUSTIN, and others, we find, in following times, proceeded a ſtep further than CYPRIAN; and, not contented with aſſerting, at an extravagant rate, the utility of baptiſm, boldly maintained its abſolute neceſſity: conſigning over to eternal ruin, all ſuch infants as died without it. See No 4, 5. And as both CYPRIAN and

* Apud *Magdeburg. Centur.* Cent. XII. p. 252.

and AUSTIN were African biſhops, there is reaſon to conclude with GROTIUS, "That, anciently, the baptiſm of infants was much more common in Africa, than in Aſia, or elſewhere; and with a greater opinion of its neceſſity *."

REFLECT. II. From the quotations before us it plainly appears, that the baptiſm of infants was introduced and prevailed, on the ſuppoſition of its being a *neceſſary* mean of human happineſs: and that this weak ſurmiſe was founded on a miſtake of our Lord's meaning, in Joh. iii. 5. See No 2. 5, 6. In like manner, a miſunderſtanding of Joh. vi. 53. produced Infant communion; as we ſhall ſee in its proper place. Had our divine Teacher, when he declared it abſolutely neceſſary to be *born of water and of the Spirit*, intended the ordinance of baptiſm by the term *water*; then, indeed, the neceſſity of that inſtitution would have unavoidably followed, as being placed on a level with the renewing agency of the Holy Spirit. But, were that the ſenſe of our Lord, it would inevitably follow, That a poſitive right is of equal neceſſity with the renovating influence of the Holy Spirit—That the ſalvation of infants, in many caſes, is rendered impoſſible; becauſe numbers of them are no ſooner born than they expire—That the eternal happineſs of all who die in their infancy muſt depend, not only on the devout care of their parents, but alſo on the preſence and pious benevolence of adminiſtrators —That all the dying infants of Jews, of Mohammedans, and of Pagans, are involved in final ruin —And that multitudes of adults muſt alſo periſh, merely for the want of baptiſm. But who can imagine that our Lord ſhould place our immortal intereſts on ſuch a footing, as neither tends to illuſtrate

* Apud POLI *Synopſ.* ad Mat. xix. 14.

trate the grace of God, nor promote the comfort of man—on ſuch a footing as is quite inimical to the ſpirit of that maxim, BY GRACE YE ARE SAVED; and has no aptitude to excite virtuous tempers in the human heart? A ſentiment of this kind is chiefly adapted to enhance the importance of the clerical character, and to make mankind conſider themſelves as under infinite obligations to a profeſſional order of their fellow mortals, for an intereſt in everlaſting bleſſedneſs. We may, therefore, ſafely conclude, that the term *water*, in our Lord's converſe with Nicodemus, does not ſignify baptiſm; and, conſequently, whatever its meaning be, the emphatical paſſage neither enjoins, nor encourages, the adminiſtration of baptiſm to infants. Hence it appears, that the main foundation of Pædobaptiſm among the Ancients, was a great miſtake; and, as ſuch, it has long been deſerted by the generality of Calviniſtic Pædobaptiſts.

REFLECT. III. The great utility of baptiſm has been variouſly repreſented by modern Pædobaptiſts. Omitting the public formulas of doctrine and worſhip, that are adopted by Papiſts, or others, abroad, and by our National Eſtabliſhment; I would only take notice of what individuals have ſaid concerning it. Dr. FEATLEY, for inſtance, has the following remarkable words: "Βαπτω, from whence *baptize* is derived, ſignifieth as well to *dye*, as to *dip*; and it may be, the Holy Ghoſt in the word *baptiſm*, hath ſome reference to that ſignification, becauſe by baptiſm *we change our* HUE. For as VARRO reporteth of a river in Bœotia, that the water thereof turneth ſheep of a dark or dun colour into *white*; ſo the ſheep of Chriſt which are waſhed in the font of baptiſm, by virtue of Chriſt's promiſe, though

though before they were of never ſo *dark*, *ſad*, or *dirty* colour, yet in their ſouls become *white* and *pure*, and as it were *new dyed**." The Reader will here excuſe a remark, by way of query. Would, then, the Doctor have treated the Baptiſts in ſuch an *illiberal* manner as he has done, if he had, either by dipping or ſprinkling, thoroughly imbibed that excellent *dye*, of which he ſpeaks? Or, would his calumniating pen have recorded the following ſentence? "The reſort of great multitudes of men and women together in the evening, and going *naked* into rivers, there to be dipt and plunged, cannot be done without ſcandal†." What a pity it is, but the Doctor had been ſoundly plunged in VARRO's Bœotian river! it might have rendered his mind more *white*, and his language more *fair*, and then the Baptiſts would not have been ſo *dirtily* handled by him.——Mr. OBED WILLS expreſſes himſelf thus: "Baptiſm is God's *ſheep-mark*, as Mr. FORD calls it, to diſtinguiſh thoſe that are of his fold, from ſuch as graze in the wild common of the world‡." It is rather dubious, however, whether the excellent mark will prove *permanent:* for this Gentleman himſelf aſſures us, that "the covenant of grace is not abſolute and ſaving, to *all* that are once within it§."——Mr. BURKIT alſo, ſpeaking of infants under the notion of *lambs*, calls baptiſm "Chriſt's *ear-mark*, by which Chriſt's ſheep are diſtinguiſhed from the devil's goats||." Thus happily have theſe authors provided for the honour of baptiſm, when the diſciples of Chriſt are conſidered under the notion

* *Dippers Dipt*, p. 41. Edit. 7. † *Idem*, p. 39. ‡ *Inf. Bap. aſſerted and vindicated*, p. 273. § *Idem*, p. 199. || *Diſc. of Inf. Bap.* in Mr. KEACH's *Rector Rectified*, p. 98.

notion of *ſheep:* for it *waſhes* their fleeces and *marks* their ears. What Pædobaptiſts may think of ſuch language, from ſuch pens, I cannot pretend to ſay; but there is reaſon to conclude, that, were any of the Baptiſts to talk at this rate, *their* conduct would be exploded with the keeneſt ridicule.

But let us hear a few more Pædobaptiſts, on the ſame ſubject. Remarkable is the language of Dr. SCOTT, when ſhewing the import of Mat. xxviii. 19. Among other things, of a ſimilar kind, he ſays: "By this commiſſion, Chriſt's miniſters are authorized and conſtituted the *legal proxies* of the Holy Trinity, in the ſtead of thoſe Bleſſed Perſons, to ſeal the New Covenant with the baptiſmal ſign to thoſe whom they baptize; and thereby *legally to oblige* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to perform the promiſes of it to all thoſe baptized perſons, who perform the conditions of it—When once we have ſtruck covenant with him [God] in baptiſm, we have him *faſt obliged* to us to perform his part of the covenant, whenever we perform ours*." *Proxies* of the Holy Trinity—*Legally oblige* the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—God *faſt obliged* to us. Peter tells us of ſome who *ſpake great ſwelling words of vanity*; and it ſeems as if the Doctor had copied after them. —Mr. GEORGE WHITEFIELD, remarking on Joh. iii. 5. aſks and anſwers, in the following manner: "Does not this verſe urge the *abſolute neceſſity* of water baptiſm? YES, where it may be had; but how God will deal with perſons unbaptized we cannot tell †."—Mr. JOHN WESLEY, among various other things of a ſimilar kind, ſays: "If infants are guilty of original ſin, in the ordinary way, they CANNOT *be*

* *Chriſtian Life*, Vol. III. p. 236, 238. Edinb. 1754.

† *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 355, 356.

be ſaved, unleſs this be waſhed away by baptiſm *." Now, that either Mr. WHITEFIELD, or Mr. WESLEY, ſhould at any time have exclaimed againſt us, on a ſuppoſition that we place too much dependence on baptiſm, is very extraordinary, while they themſelves talked at this extravagant rate! A writer, however, of greater eminence, perhaps, than any of thoſe I have juſt mentioned, claims our attention, and to the conſideration of what he ſays we now proceed.

Mr. MATTHEW HENRY, in different parts of his *Treatiſe on Baptiſm*, lately publiſhed, when ſpeaking about the ordinance itſelf, its obligation, and the privileges of baptized perſons, has the following remarkable words. "Such are the privileges which attend the ordinance, that if our Maſter had bid us do ſome great thing, would we not have done it, rather than come ſhort of them? much more when he only ſaith unto us, *waſh and be clean*; *waſh and be* CHRISTIANS—The goſpel contains, not only a doctrine but a covenant, and *by baptiſm* we are brought into that covenant—Baptiſm *wreſts the keys of the heart* out of the hands of the ſtrong man armed, that the poſſeſſion may be ſurrendered to him whoſe right it is—The water of baptiſm is DESIGNED *for our cleanſing from the ſpots and defilements of the fleſh* †—In baptiſm our names are *engraved*

* *Preſervative*, p. 160.

† Whether Mr. HENRY confine the cleanſing efficacy of baptiſmal water to the pollution of *actual* ſin, or whether he conſider its admirably purifying virtue as extending to *innate* depravity alſo, is not very clear. If he include both ideas, he attributes more to baptiſm than AMBROSE did; who repreſents actual ſin as taken away by *baptiſm*, but hereditary depravity, by *waſhing of the feet*. Apud VENEM. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. IV. p. 122.

graved upon the breaſt plate of this great High-Prieſt —This then is the efficacy of baptiſm; it is *putting the child's name* into the goſpel grant—We are baptized into Chriſt's death; i. e. God doth in that ordinance, *ſeal, confirm,* and *make over* to us, ALL the benefits of the death of Chriſt—Infant baptiſm ſpeaks an *hereditary* relation to God, that comes to us by *deſcent*—Baptiſm *ſeals* the promiſe of God's being to ME a God, and that is greatly encouraging; but *Infant* baptiſm encreaſes the encouragement, as it *aſſures* me of God's being the God of my *fathers,* and the God of my *infancy* *."—Such are the language and ſentiments of Mr. HENRY, reſpecting the utility of baptiſm! After all this, we ſhould not have much wondered, if he had maintained with Mr. DODWELL, that it is by baptiſm the ſoul is rendered *immortal*; or if he had ſaid, that all the baptized offspring of believers ſhall be *finally ſaved,* let them die whenever they may. But as our Brethren often refer us to the ancient rite of circumciſion, and the writings of the Talmud, for inſtruction about the proper ſubjects of baptiſm; ſo who can tell, but the opinion of Jewiſh Rabbies concerning the utility of *circumciſion* may be of uſe to direct our inquiries in regard to that of *baptiſm*; and then, perhaps, we may have all Mr. HENRY ſays confirmed in a few words. Well, you have their opinion, as expreſſed by one of them, in the following extract: "So great is the virtue of the precept concerning circumciſion, that *no circumciſed* perſon goes down to hell, or to purgatory †."—But what would our oppoſers have ſaid, had a poſthumous work of the late

* *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 12. 40. 42, 43. 59. 130. 170. 193. 201. † Apud WITSIUM, *Miſcell. Sac.* Tom. II. Exercit. XXI. § 9.

late Dr. GILL, for inſtance, appeared, if it had been fraught with ſuch high-flown expreſſions as thoſe of Mr. HENRY, concerning the vaſt importance and various utility of baptiſm? They would have ſpoken, there is reaſon to think, in ſome ſuch manner as this: "The Doctor might well plead for his beloved immerſion with all his learning and zeal, while he imagined that ſuch were its bleſſed effects: for, ſurely, he never could ſuppoſe that a *little* water was equal to *theſe* advantages. It appears, however, that, while he bends his force to maintain a darling practice, he groſſly intrenches on the honour of divine grace, for which he affected to be thought an able and a warm defender: that ſame favourite plunging of his being repreſented by him, as little ſhort of a ſubſtitute for electing love, atoning blood, and ſanctifying influence. For, after having written many a long page againſt the Arminians, it now appears, that he conſidered the ſolemn dipping of a perſon in water, as putting his name into the goſpel grant—as wreſting the key of his heart out of the hands of Satan—as putting him into the covenant—as writing his name on the breaſt plate of our great High-Prieſt—as cleanſing him from the defilements of the fleſh—as making him a Chriſtian—as ſealing, confirming, and making over to him, all the benefits of our Lord's death—and, finally, as ſealing the promiſe to him of God being to him a God. Admirable plunging, truly! Who, on ſuch grounds, would not be dipped, aye, and dipped again? Had but the Doctor ſoundly proved all theſe *ipſe dixits*, we ſhould no longer have objected againſt immerſion, as being either dangerous, or indecent; but have cheerfully ſubmitted to it, though in the cold of Ruſſia and in the preſence of

ten

ten thouſand ſpectators."—Such, I preſume, would have been the remarks of our opponents upon it. The Reader perceives, however, that it is not Dr. GILL, that it is not any *Baptiſt*, but Mr. HENRY, who talks at this wonderful rate.—Now, though I am far from conſidering that worthy author as avowing the *natural conſequences* of his own poſitions; yet I cannot but view the *poſitions themſelves*, as unwarrantable, extravagant, and of a dangerous tendency. Yet, calculated as the language and ſentiments of Mr. HENRY are, to excite in the breaſts of ignorant perſons a deceitful dependence on the baptiſmal rite; it is manifeſt from eccleſiaſtical hiſtory that things of a ſimilar kind, and often if poſſible more groſſly erroneous, have been aſſerted by Pædobaptiſts in every age from the time of CYPRIAN to the preſent day. And, indeed, when it is conſidered that an unwarrantable opinion about the neceſſity of baptiſm, ſeems to have laid the foundation for baptizing infants: it is no wonder that Pædobaptiſts, both ancient and modern, ſhould frequently repreſent that practice as vaſtly important. To a dangerous miſtake of this kind, the eſpouſers of Infant baptiſm are apparently more liable, than ſuch as baptize thoſe only who make a profeſſion of repentance and faith: for no *Baptiſt* miniſter, without notoriouſly confronting the grand principle on which he proceeds in adminiſtering the ſolemn rite, can ever teach, that baptiſm is a mean of producing thoſe great effects which Mr. HENRY and a thouſand others have mentioned. To maintain, with a reſolute perſeverance, that the laws of Chriſt relating to a poſitive inſtitution ſhould be ſtrictly obſerved, is one thing; to inſiſt upon it, or to inſinuate, that baptiſm, to whomſoever adminiſtered, is the medium

of

of procuring thoſe bleſſings to which we advert, is another. The *former*, is our indiſpenſible duty: the *latter*, is pregnant with dangerous conſequences.

That baptiſm is of real importance to the church of Chriſt, and that believers, in a cheerful ſubmiſſion to it, have reaſon to expect a bleſſing *, we firmly maintain; but that Infant baptiſm is big with *much greater* advantages, than Adult baptiſm, as Mr. HENRY inſiſts, we cannot admit. His words are as follow: "That which ſhakes many in the doctrine of Infant baptiſm, is the uſeleſſneſs (as they apprehend) of the adminiſtration, and the mighty advantages which they fancy in Adult baptiſm. But before they conclude thus, they would do well to anſwer Dr. FORD's proof of this truth, That there is *much more* advantage to be made, in order to ſanctification, conſolation, and ſeveral other ways, of the doctrine and practice of *Infant* baptiſm, than of that doctrine and practice, which limits baptiſm to perſonal profeſſion at years of diſcretion †." —Though there are few aſſertions in the reſpectable author's Treatiſe, that have leſs pretence to evidence from Scripture than the paſſage here produced; yet he ſpeaks with an uncommon degree of aſſurance. This reminds me of what I have ſomewhere ſeen remarked concerning BELLARMINE. That zealous Cardinal, it has been obſerved, when he had the leaſt appearance of reaſon, or Scripture, for what he was going to ſay, commonly aſſumed the moſt confident airs, and was pretty ſure to introduce it with a *proculdubio*. Now, though we cannot accept of Mr. HENRY's challenge to anſwer Dr. FORD's arguments in defence of this bold poſition, becauſe

* See *General Remarks*, REMARK V. near the end of this work.

† *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 179.

becauſe we do not know what they were; yet we will ſuggeſt a few thoughts, in oppoſition to the poſition itſelf, and leave the Reader to judge.

What, then, can be the reaſon of Infant baptiſm being much more advantageous than Adult baptiſm? Is it becauſe the former is *more ſolemn*, in itſelf? if we appeal to Dr. WALL his anſwer will be; "The baptiſm of an infant *cannot* have all the ſolemnity, which that of an adult perſon may have. The previous faſting and prayer, the penitential confeſſions, the zeal and humility and deep affection of the receiver, may be viſible there; which cannot be in the caſe of an infant *."—Is it becauſe infants are *better capable* of reflecting on the nature, the deſign, the obligation of baptiſm, than adults; or becauſe they are more proper ſubjects of miniſterial exhortation? None will pretend the one or the other.—Peter ſpeaks of baptized perſons having *the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God.* Is it, then, becauſe infants have a better *conſcience* and make a better *anſwer* than believing adults? That cannot be: for as the minds of mere infants are not capable of comparing their own conduct with the rule of duty, they have, properly ſpeaking, no conſcience at all. Our Brethren, indeed, frequently ſpeak of *covenanting* with God, in baptiſm: but the language of common ſenſe, as well as of caſuiſts, is: "That *infants* are not capable of contracting †," either with God or man.—Is it becauſe the conſcience of a perſon is more tenderly affected, by conſidering what was done for him, while *incapable* of moral agency; than by reflecting on what was done by him and upon him, with the *full conſent* of his will? To ſuppoſe

* *Defence of Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 404.

† Dr. AMES *De Conſcientia*, L. V. C. XLII. § 2.

poſe any ſuch thing, inſults the underſtanding and feelings of mankind. For, as Bp. SANDERSON obſerves, "In perſonal obligations no man is bound without his own conſent;—and a ſpiritual obligation, which is in the *conſcience*, muſt neceſſarily be perſonal, as every one's conſcience is his own; and ſuch an obligation cannot paſs into another perſon *." Children, when arrived at the years of diſcretion, may be *told* that they covenanted with God, when baptized in their infancy; but, as engaging to be the Lord's is a perſonal thing, and as they could have no idea of ſuch a tranſaction at the time of their baptiſm, ſo they cannot have any recollection of it: conſequently, their conſciences cannot feel an obligation, in that reſpect, as thoſe of baptized believers may and ought.—The writer of theſe pages takes it for granted, that the regiſter of a certain pariſh bears teſtimony to his having had ſomething done for him in his infancy, called *baptiſm*, attended with all the formalities of proxies, and of thankſgivings for his being then regenerated, and ſo on; but he knows nothing about it, except by report. Nor, to the beſt of his recollection, did he ever feel his conſcience under any obligation, in virtue of thoſe tranſactions; though he had no doubts concerning the validity of his Infant ſprinkling till he was grown up; and though, through divine goodneſs, he had abiding impreſſions on his mind, relating to his beſt intereſts, from the earlieſt period of his preſent remembrance.

Further: It is of importance here to obſerve, what our oppoſers themſelves, I think, will allow, That the proper ſtandard of uſefulneſs, in regard to any poſitive rite, is, not our own fancies, or feelings, or reaſon; but divine Revelation: and, that even

* *De Juramenti Obligatione*, Prælect. IV. § 9.

even an unſcriptural ceremony may, through the kindneſs of Providence, become the occaſion of ſpiritual advantage to one or another. For, without intending an invidious compariſon, and merely for the ſake of argument, it may be aſked; Whether it can be aſſerted with prudence, that none of the Papal ſuperſtitions were ever improved by Providence, as occaſions of laſting ſpiritual benefit to any one? But yet, as Mr. STODDARD obſerves, "If men act according to their own humours and fancies, and do not keep in the *way* of obedience, it is preſumption to *expect* God's bleſſing. Mat. xv. 9. *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men**." I will add, in the words of that great man Mr. JONATH. EDWARDS; "Though we are to eye the providence of God, and not diſregard his works, yet to interpret them to a ſenſe, or apply them to a uſe, inconſiſtent with the ſcope of the *word* of God, is a miſconſtruction and miſapplication of them. God has not given us his *Providence*, but his *Word*, to be our governing rule. God is ſovereign in his diſpenſations of providence; he beſtowed the bleſſing on Jacob, even when he had a *lie* in his mouth: he was pleaſed to meet with Solomon, and make known himſelf to him, and bleſs him in an extraordinary manner, while he was worſhipping in an *high place*: he met with Saul, when in a courſe of *violent oppoſition* to him and out of the way of his duty to the higheſt degree, going to Damaſcus to perſecute Chriſt; and even then beſtowed the greateſt bleſſing upon him, that perhaps ever was beſtowed on a mere man. The conduct of divine Providence, with its reaſons, is

* In Mr. JONATH. EDWARDS's *Inquiry into Qualif. for Communion*, p. 117.

is too little underſtood by us, to be improved as our rule*."—Further: Were the dupes of Papal ſuperſtition, or our Brethren of the Engliſh Eſtabliſhment, aſked, what advantage they have, in compariſon with us Diſſenters; they, very likely, would anſwer with Paul in another caſe, *Much, every way.* They would alſo, no doubt, mention a variety of particulars to prove, that their forms and rites are far better adapted to excite devotional diſpoſitions, and ſo to promote ſanctification, conſolation, and ſo on, than thoſe of Diſſenters. But would Mr. HENRY have conſidered ſuch pretences as any kind of proof, that thoſe forms and ceremonies are warranted of God? No, he would have been ready to ſay, "Shew us your authority for them in our only rule of religious worſhip, and then tell us how uſeful they are."

Theſe things being obſerved, we add; If Infant baptiſm be ſo *very uſeful*, the Apoſtles muſt have known it as well, and have eſteemed it as highly, as our author himſelf. But have they *acted* as if they thus knew and eſteemed it? Their Immortal Writings make a conſiderable volume; and in that heavenly volume they have recorded their own faith and their own practice. Conſcious of being amanuenſes to the Spirit of wiſdom, they intended that ſacred Book ſhould be conſidered as a body of doctrine and a complete code of law for the church in every ſucceeding age. This being the caſe, it is quite natural to think, that Infant baptiſm ſhould make a capital figure in ſuch a ſyſtem of theological doctrine, of ſpiritual privilege, and of religious duty, if they had known and viewed it in that *very advantageous* point of light which Mr. HENRY did. That they

* *Ut ſupra*, p. 131.

they expreſſly mention the baptiſm of adults, is allowed by all; and that their baptiſm is repreſented in the New Teſtament as inſtructive and uſeful, is denied by few: conſequently, if the baptiſm of infants be *much more* adapted to promote ſanctification and conſolation than the baptiſm of thoſe who profeſs faith, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles would inſiſt upon it in a degree proportional to its greater importance. But is it a fact, that Pædobaptiſm itſelf, and the benefits reſulting from it, make ſuch a conſpicuous figure in the apoſtolic writings? That the Apoſtles mention baptiſm, and inform us that great numbers were baptized, are facts; but where do they mention Infant baptiſm? That they mention the ordinance as containing, matter of inſtruction, motives to holineſs, and grounds of exhortation, in reference to baptized believers, is a fact*; but where is Pædobaptiſm repreſented by them, as containing any of theſe things, with regard to children when they grow up? That they mention baptiſm as affording grounds of reproof to diſorderly profeſſors, is a fact; ſee 1 Cor. i. 12—16. but where do they mention Pædobaptiſm as miniſtering reproof to Chriſtian parents, for neglecting the education of their children? That they exhort and caution believing parents, reſpecting their children, is a fact; but where do they fetch their motives from Infant baptiſm? That they exhort and charge children to be dutiful to their parents, is alſo a fact; but where do they remind children of their filial obligations being inforced by having been baptized in their infancy, or exhort them on that ground? Yet, had Pædobaptiſm been then practiſed, and had it been attended with ſuch vaſt advantages as our author pretends,

* Rom. vi. 1—5. 1 Cor. i. 12—16. and xv. 29. Col. ii. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

tends, it might, perhaps, have been as pertinently urged as the latter part of the fifth command, on account of its being more preciſely agreeable to the Goſpel Diſpenſation. See Eph. vi. 1, 2, 3. Mr. HENRY, it is plain, did not fail to exhort both parents and children, on the ground of Infant baptiſm. No, he treats it as a *capital ſource* of motives, by which to inforce the performance of both parental and filial duty; though the Apoſtles have not ſaid a word about it, in any of their exhortations. Candour forbids me ſuppoſing, that he thought himſelf, either more *wiſe* in the choice of his arguments, or more *zealous* in the application of them to practical purpoſes, than thoſe Ambaſſadors of Chriſt were; but yet every one may ſee, that there is a remarkable difference between their conduct and his, in this reſpect; which difference muſt have had an adequate cauſe. I cannot help thinking, therefore, that, either the inſpired Writers knew nothing at all of Pædobaptiſm, or had a very mean opinion of it: for it ſeems unaccountably ſtrange, that they ſhould all have approved the practice, and yet all agree, on ſuch a variety of occaſions, in ſaying nothing about it. But, ſuppoſing it was practiſed by them, and that they conſidered it as *much more* advantageous than the baptiſm of believers, their conduct is yet more amazingly ſtrange: becauſe they *expreſſly* apply the latter to practical purpoſes, though *intirely ſilent* about the former. An example this, which our opponents do not care to imitate. Peruſe the writings of modern Pædobaptiſts, and you plainly perceive the advantages reſulting from baptiſm, almoſt intirely confined to that of *infants*. Conſult the apoſtolic records, and you find them all connected with the baptiſm of *adults*. We may

now venture an appeal to the Reader, whether he would not ſuſpect any unknown author of being a *Baptiſt*, were he to find him treating on all the various topics juſt enumerated, and yet perceive that he is quite ſilent about Infant baptiſm?

Again: Mr. PEIRCE and Dr. PRIESTLEY tell us, that various and great advantages would probably attend the revival of Infant *communion* among us, and labour to reſtore the practice in this country from that conſideration. Were Mr. HENRY now living, we might therefore venture to return his challenge, by ſaying; Let him anſwer the arguments produced by Mr. PEIRCE in favour of that hypotheſis, without ſubverting his *own*, for the utility of Infant baptiſm. For it is plain to us, that moſt of the principles on which he proceeds to prove the benefits of Pædobaptiſm, would equally apply to Infant communion.—In a word, either the baptiſm of infants has been ſadly miſrepreſented by the generality of thoſe who have pleaded for it, ſince the time of CYPRIAN; or it is calculated to do immenſe miſchief to the ſouls of men; by leading perſons to imagine, that they were born again, cleanſed from ſin, intereſted in all the benefits of our Lord's death, and made heirs of the kingdom of heaven, by what was done for them while deſtitute of reaſon—done for them, in many caſes, by ungodly prieſts and profligate ſponſors. For, as Dr. OWEN has well obſerved, the father of lies himſelf could not eaſily have invented a more deadly poiſon for the ſouls of ſinners; as they are taught, by theſe unſcriptural dogmas, to reſt ſatisfied with a ſuppoſed regeneration by their baptiſm *.

* *Theologoumena*, L. VI. C. V. § III. Brem.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Concerning the MODERN *Grounds of Pædobaptiſm*; namely, *Jewiſh Proſelyte Baptiſm—External Covenant Relation—Jewiſh Circumciſion—Particular Paſſages of Scripture*—and *Apoſtolic Tradition.*

SECTION I.

Jewiſh Proſelyte Baptiſm.

MR. T. BRADBURY: "I know it is ſaid, that the Jews had a method of baptizing among them, and that our Saviour only fixed it with his diſciples as he found it with his countrymen;—— but the Bible itſelf will not allow me to think as theſe men do, whatever their learning is——Nothing can be more apparent, than that the Jews expected that the perſon who brought baptiſm amongſt them, muſt be either the Meſſiah himſelf, or one of his fore-runners. This was the queſtion of the prieſts and Levites, who came from Jeruſalem, to aſk John, whether he was the Chriſt, or Elias, or that Prophet. And they that were ſent, were of the Phariſees, a people diligent to know the law, and zealous to advance it. Therefore they aſk him farther, *Why baptizeſt thou then, if thou be not the Chriſt, nor Elias, nor the Prophet?* And John in his anſwer ſhews us, that though the Jews miſtook in a circumſtance, yet they were right in their notion. I knew him not, ſays he, but that HE ſhould be manifeſt to Iſrael, *therefore am I come* baptizing with water——The Apoſtle in his ſermon at Antioch (though he abounded in Jewiſh learning) ſeems to

to ſay, that they never heard of any baptizing before John, Acts xiii. 24, 25. John firſt preached before Chriſt the baptiſm of repentance, to all the people of Iſrael; and, as he fulfilled his courſe, he ſaid, *Whom think ye that I am? I am not he*——From which things I conclude, that the *firſt* time that ever the church heard of baptiſm, was in reference to a perſon who was actually then among them, and after a few weeks was to be declared and ſhewn forth to Iſrael——To fetch it [baptiſm] from the Jews, and eſpecially from thoſe traditional ſervices that obtained in their church, is *a wild imagination*, and no better than ſeeking the living among the dead. They had *divers waſhings* and carnal ordinances, but our baptiſm was not one of them; for theſe were only impoſed on the people *till the time of reformation*, Heb. ix. 10. And therefore as they were all to be aboliſhed, we cannot ſuppoſe that any of thoſe *worldly elements* ſhould be tranſplanted into our religion, to leave any remains of bondage upon the glorious liberty of the ſons of God. Peter ſpeaks to thoſe that knew nothing of that ordinance, as if it were a thing intirely new among them; *Repent and be baptized every one of you:* and it's ſaid, *We are baptized into Chriſt.* Acts ii. 38. Rom. vi. 3. ——Both theſe ſolemnities [baptiſm and the holy ſupper] are repreſented as no more than *fragments* of Judaiſm. As if there was any propriety in our Lord telling the diſciples, that *all power was given to him both in heaven and in earth*, only to recommend a ſcrap of an old religion: Or, as if the Apoſtle had any need to ſay, he had *received that of the Lord*, which he received by *the tradition of his fathers.*" *Duty and Doc. of Bap.* p. 55, 56, 57. 148. *Neceſſ. of Contend. for Revealed Relig.* p. 50.

2. LAMPE:

2. LAMPE: "*And they aſked him and ſaid, Why then baptizeſt thou, if thou be not the Chriſt?*—They who think that the baptiſm of Proſelytes was uſed before the time of John, obſerve, That the meſſengers did not move the queſtion concerning *baptiſm itſelf*, as an unuſual rite; but concerning the authority with which he was veſted to uſe it among ſuch perſons as were born in covenant with God. It is, however, not only *doubtful*, whether that baptiſm be of ſo great antiquity; but even if we ſhould grant that it was then in uſe, I do not imagine that the Phariſees here had any thought about it ——ALTINGIUS, LIGHTFOOT, CARPZOVIUS, EDZARDUS, and DANZIUS, have diligently handled this ſubject; but WERNSDORFIUS, and others, have examined their arguments, and ſhewn the *uncertainty* of their hypotheſis. Meanwhile, all the difficulties are not ſo removed, as to render either the one or the other hypotheſis, intirely eligible. That rite, perhaps, was the invention of the Phariſees, and ſo not the general practice of the Jews, but peculiar to that ſect, who were fond of bathing." *Comment. in Evang. ſecund. Joan.* ad Cap. I. 25.

3. VENEMA: "Part of John's office conſiſted in *baptizing*——an external rite, then, in a particular manner, appointed of God, and *not uſed before*, Joh. i. Mat. xxii." *Inſtitut. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. III. Secul. I. § 5.

4. Mr. SELDEN: "MAIMONIDES informs us, *That a proſelyte, who is circumciſed and not baptized, or baptized and not circumciſed, is by no means to be accounted a proſelyte, before he be both baptized and circumciſed. Nor was baptiſm lawful, unleſs performed in the preſence of three men. And, ſeeing it is a* FORENSIC *act (the three men, who preſided in this affair,*

to ſay, that they never heard of any baptizing before John, Acts xiii. 24, 25. John firſt preached before Chriſt the baptiſm of repentance, to all the people of Iſrael; and, as he fulfilled his courſe, he ſaid, *Whom think ye that I am? I am not he*——From which things I conclude, that the *firſt* time that ever the church heard of baptiſm, was in reference to a perſon who was actually then among them, and after a few weeks was to be declared and ſhewn forth to Iſrael——To fetch it [baptiſm] from the Jews, and eſpecially from thoſe traditional ſervices that obtained in their church, is *a wild imagination*, and no better than ſeeking the living among the dead. They had *divers waſhings* and carnal ordinances, but our baptiſm was not one of them; for theſe were only impoſed on the people *till the time of reformation*, Heb. ix. 10. And therefore as they were all to be aboliſhed, we cannot ſuppoſe that any of thoſe *worldly elements* ſhould be tranſplanted into our religion, to leave any remains of bondage upon the glorious liberty of the ſons of God. Peter ſpeaks to thoſe that knew nothing of that ordinance, as if it were a thing intirely new among them; *Repent and be baptized every one of you:* and it's ſaid, *We are baptized into Chriſt.* Acts ii. 38. Rom. vi. 3. ——Both theſe ſolemnities [baptiſm and the holy ſupper] are repreſented as no more than *fragments* of Judaiſm. As if there was any propriety in our Lord telling the diſciples, that *all power was given to him both in heaven and in earth*, only to recommend a ſcrap of an old religion: Or, as if the Apoſtle had any need to ſay, he had *received that of the Lord*, which he received by *the tradition of his fathers.*" *Duty and Doc. of Bap.* p. 55, 56, 57. 148. *Neceſſ. of Contend. for Revealed Relig.* p. 50.

2. LAMPE:

2. LAMPE: "*And they aſked him and ſaid, Why then baptizeſt thou, if thou be not the Chriſt?*—They who think that the baptiſm of Proſelytes was uſed before the time of John, obſerve, That the meſſengers did not move the queſtion concerning *baptiſm itſelf*, as an unuſual rite; but concerning the authority with which he was veſted to uſe it among ſuch perſons as were born in covenant with God. It is, however, not only *doubtful*, whether that baptiſm be of ſo great antiquity; but even if we ſhould grant that it was then in uſe, I do not imagine that the Phariſees here had any thought about it ——ALTINGIUS, LIGHTFOOT, CARPZOVIUS, EDZARDUS, and DANZIUS, have diligently handled this ſubject; but WERNSDORFIUS, and others, have examined their arguments, and ſhewn the *uncertainty* of their hypotheſis. Meanwhile, all the difficulties are not ſo removed, as to render either the one or the other hypotheſis, intirely eligible. That rite, perhaps, was the invention of the Phariſees, and ſo not the general practice of the Jews, but peculiar to that ſect, who were fond of bathing." *Comment. in Evang. ſecund. Joan.* ad Cap. I. 25.

3. VENEMA: "Part of John's office conſiſted in *baptizing*——an external rite, then, in a particular manner, appointed of God, and *not uſed before*, Joh. i. Mat. xxii." *Inſtitut. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. III. Secul. I. § 5.

4. Mr. SELDEN: "MAIMONIDES informs us, *That a proſelyte, who is circumciſed and not baptized, or baptized and not circumciſed, is by no means to be accounted a proſelyte, before he be both baptized and circumciſed. Nor was baptiſm lawful, unleſs performed in the preſence of three men. And, ſeeing it is a* FORENSIC *act* (*the three men, who preſided in this affair,*

affair, conſtituting a kind of COURT—) *therefore baptiſm was not rightly adminiſtered, either on the* SABBATH, *or on a* FEAST *day, or by* NIGHT. *In which times, nevertheleſs, if peradventure it be performed, the perſon ſo baptized is a proſelyte.* That is, the act was not invalid, though it ought not to have been done. What is added concerning the *time*, relates to the particular days and hours of the *court ſeſſions*. But if fewer than *three men* were preſent at the baptiſm, it was accounted vain, and not eſteemed an act of initiation——It was never repeated, not even on the *poſterity* of thoſe who had been thus baptized." *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* L. II. C. II. p. 139. 142. Argent. Vid. LEUSDENI *Philol. Heb. Mixt.* Differt. XXI. p. 144. and Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Introduct. p. 50.

5. DEYLINGIUS: "The baptiſm of Proſelytes, in our opinion, ſeems to have been received by the Jews after the time of John the Baptiſt; being very much influenced by his authority and greatly admiring him. *Certainly* it cannot be proved, by any ſubſtantial teſtimony, that it was in uſe among the Jews before the time of John. There is alſo a great difference between the baptiſm of John and that of Proſelytes, as the latter is deſcribed in the monuments of the ancient Hebrews. For the Jewiſh baptiſm was a rite of *human inſtitution*; but John the Baptiſt introduced his by the *command of God*, Joh. i. 33. and ſubſtituted it in the place of circumciſion——The baptiſm of Proſelytes was a *civil* rite, pertaining only to the *political court*; as CAMPEGIUS VITRINGA ſhews in his *Archi-Synagogus*, p. 400. But the baptiſm of John and of Chriſt is peculiar to the *Chriſtian church*, and is the mean of confering ſpiritual benefits. *That* was not to be continued to children; for the proſelyted parents being

being baptized, their future offspring had no need of baptiſm. On the contrary, among Chriſtians the ſalutary laver is to be continued in regard to their poſterity." *Obſervat. Sac.* Pars III. Obſerv. XXVI. p. 197, 198.

6. Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL: "What ſo viſible affinity, I beſeech you, is there between a *burial* and *waſhing*, that *Chriſtian* baptiſm ſhould be conſidered as deriving its original from the waſhings, and baptiſms of the *Jews?* If it were true that our baptiſm was deſigned to ſignify a *waſhing* or *cleanſing*; or if it were true, that the Jews from the beginning admitted either their own children, or Proſelytes, into their church, by the adminiſtration of baptiſm, which has been aſſerted of late, by ſome very learned men; there would, I confeſs, be a probable argument, that the inſtitution of our baptiſm was fetched from the baptiſms of the Jews: but whereas, concerning the *former*, the contrary has been already proved*; and concerning the *latter*, nothing certain appears; I think the *old argument* of circumciſion is much more proper and more ſtrong for the baptiſm of infants, than this, which is *new* and *uncertain*. For our baptiſm is really the repreſentation of a *burial* and a *reſurrection*, and not of *waſhing*; as has been ſufficiently proved. In regard to the argument of thoſe perſons, who are inclined to derive our baptiſm from the Jewiſh waſhings, as there is no certainty in it, ſo alſo it is ſo far from being ſupported by the authority of the holy Scripture, that I can ſcarcely find any trace of it, in the Old Teſtament. They would derive its origin from the word כבס, *to waſh*, or *cleanſe*, Exod. xix. 10: but the Rabbies, if I miſtake not, have the word טבל, for baptiſm, which ſignifies *immerſion*; plainly intimating,

* See CHAP. III. No 48.

mating, that they owe the notion of that word to the *Greeks*, or rather to the *Chriſtians*. For what affinity is there, between *waſhing* and *immerſion*? for we read that ſome were even baptized in ſand. But the thing is ſo uncertain, that it cannot be affirmed concerning the Rabbies, that they did not diſagree about it among themſelves. For in that very paſſage, which is quoted by learned men in favour of the practice, Rabbi ELIEZER expreſſly contradicts Rabbi JOSHUA, who was the firſt, ſo far as I know, that aſſerted this kind of baptiſm among the Jews. For Rabbi ELIEZER (as is affirmed by the Talmud) who was cotemporary with Rabbi JOSHUA, if not prior to him, plainly ſays; *That a proſelyte circumciſed, and not baptized, is a true proſelyte; for ſo we read concerning our Fathers, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, who were circumciſed and not baptized.* But, on the contrary, Rabbi JOSHUA affirms, *That he who is baptized, and not circumciſed, is a proſelyte.* Now to which of theſe ſhall I prefer an aſſent? To ELIEZER, who affirms what the Scripture teaches? or to JOSHUA, who affirms what the Scripture no where aſſerts? But the Rabbies (and what wonder?) patronize the opinion of Rabbi JOSHUA, becauſe it made for their purpoſe: that is, it was for the honour of the Jewiſh religion, that the Chriſtians *ſhould borrow their ſacred rites from them.* But when I ſee perſons of great learning, in theſe times, deriving the foundations of truth from the Rabbies, I cannot but heſitate a little. *For whence was the Talmud ſent us* (they are the words of BUXTORF, in his *Synagoga Judaica*) *that we ſhould give it ſo much credit as to believe, that we either ought, or can, underſtand the Moſaic law by the help of it?* Much leſs the *Goſpel*, to which the compilers of the

Talmud

Talmud were profeſſed enemies. For the Talmud is called, *A labyrinth of errors, and the foundation of Jewiſh fables.* It was perfected and accounted authentic, *five hundred* years after Chriſt: it is not reaſonable, therefore, to acquieſce in its teſtimony. And, which is of more force with me, JOSEPHUS himſelf, (to ſay nothing of all the Fathers before the Talmud) who was alſo a *Jew*, and cotemporary with Rabbi ELIEZER, who likewiſe profeſſedly wrote concerning the rites, cuſtoms, and acts of the Jews, is *intirely ſilent* about this affair. To me, therefore, it is an argument next to demonſtration, that two perſons of ſuch great eminence, both Jews, and cotemporary, the one ſhould *expreſſly deny*, and the other make *no mention at all* of this baptiſm, in his hiſtory. Beſides, if baptiſm, in the modern ſenſe, had been uſed among the Jews in ancient times, how came the Phariſees thus to addreſs John the Baptiſt; *Why then baptizeſt thou, if thou art not the Chriſt, nor Elias, nor that Prophet?* Joh. i. 25. Do they not plainly intimate, that there was *no uſe* of baptiſm before; and that there *ought to be none*, till either Chriſt, or Elias, or that Prophet, ſhould come? How, then, there ſhould be ſo great an affinity between our baptiſm, and the baptiſms of the Jews, that the one ſhould be thought, by any right or pretence, to ſucceed the other, is, I confeſs, beyond my belief. But ARRIAN, they ſay denominates a Jew, one that is *dipt*. I think, however, with his Commentator, that he *ſpake confuſedly*, and rather meant a *Chriſtian*, than a *Jew*; as alſo, in another place, he calls the Chriſtians, *Galileans*. And ſo LUBINUS, on thoſe words of JUVENAL, *Sat.* III. 13, 14.

Nunc ſacri fontis nemus, et delubra locantur
Judæis;——

by *Jews*, will have *Chriſtians* to be underſtood: who being expelled the city by an edict of DOMITIAN, were forced to inhabit thoſe woods that were devoted to Pagan ſuperſtition." *Animadverſ. in Lib. Nov. Teſt.* p. 182, 183, 184.

7. Dr. OWEN: "The celebrated SELDEN has endeavoured to prove, that Chriſt borrowed the rite of baptiſm from that which was then in uſe among the Jews. Others do the ſame——Learned men teach and confidently affirm, that a proſelyte of righteouſneſs was never made, though circumciſed, without being baptized. But that any one ſhould be made a partaker of all the privileges of that church, there was need only of circumciſion, as expreſs teſtimonies of the holy Scripture teach; for ſo the law runs, Exod. xii. 48. Concerning the Rabbinical baptiſm *not a tittle*. But they think, that this Proſelyte baptiſm took its riſe from another legal appointment—For, before the giving of the law, Jehovah ſpake to Moſes and ſaid; *Go unto the people and ſanctify them to day and to-morrow, and let them waſh their clothes*, Exod. xix. 10—But this was the waſhing of their *clothes*. By clothes, they ſay, the *whole body* is underſtood. Whence does that appear? The Rabbies ſo teach. There is no reaſon, however, that we ſhould believe them, contrary to expreſs teſtimonies of Scripture—This waſhing of *clothes* ſerved that ſingle occaſion only, and was a token of reverence for the Divine Preſence in the ſolemn giving of the law; nor did it pertain to the ſtated worſhip of God. So that the neceſſity of baptizing *perſons*, by a ſtated and ſolemn rite for ever, ſhould ariſe from a ſingle inſtance of waſhing *garments*, and that depending on a reaſon which would never more occur; concerning the obſervation of which no mention is made, nor is any trace found, in all the Old Teſtament,

and

and which is not confirmed by any divine command, appointment, or direction, ſeems *abſolutely improbable*—The inſtitution of the rite of baptiſm is no where mentioned in the Old Teſtament. There is no example of it in thoſe ancient records: nor was it ever uſed, in the admiſſion of Proſelytes, while the Jewiſh church continued. No mention of it occurs in PHILO, in JOSEPHUS, in JESUS the Son of Syrach, nor in the Evangelical Hiſtory. This Rabbinical opinion, therefore, owes its riſe to the *Tanneræ*, or Ante-Miſhnical doctors, after the deſtruction of their city—The opinion of ſome learned men, therefore, about the transfering of a Jewiſh baptiſmal rite (which, in reality, did not then exiſt) by the Lord Jeſus, for the uſe of his diſciples, IS DESTITUTE OF ALL PROBABILITY." *Theologoumena*, L. V. Digreſs. IV. p. 425, 426, 427. *On Heb.* Vol. I. Exercit. XIX. p. 272.

8. Dr. JENNINGS: "It is a further ſuppoſition of GODWIN's, [in his *Moſes and Aaron*] that our Saviour converted this Jewiſh Proſelyte baptiſm into a Chriſtian ſacrament. Upon this notion Dr. WALL hath founded an argument for baptiſing children, as well as adult perſons; becauſe when a parent was proſelyted, all his children were baptiſed, as well as all his male children circumciſed. But as baptiſm was adminiſtered, according to the Jewiſh Doctors, only to the children born *before* his proſelytiſm, not to *any born afterwards*, nor to his more diſtant poſterity, who were eſteemed holy branches in virtue of ſpringing from an holy root; ſome infer, that under the Chriſtian diſpenſation, baptiſm is only to be adminiſtered to converts from Judaiſm, Mahometaniſm, Paganiſm, or ſome other religion, and to their deſcendents born *before* their converſion and baptiſm, but to none

none born *after*. Mr. EMLYN, in particular, inſiſts upon this argument againſt the conſtant and univerſal obligation of Infant baptiſm. But after all, it remains to be proved, not only that Chriſtian baptiſm was inſtituted in the room of Proſelyte baptiſm; but that the Jews *had any ſuch baptiſm* in our Saviour's time. The earlieſt accounts we have of it are in the Miſhna and Gemara; the former compiled, as the Jews aſſert, by Rabbi JUDA, in the ſecond century, though learned men in general bring it *ſeveral centuries lower*; the latter not till the ſeventh century. There is not a word of it in PHILO; nor yet in JOSEPHUS, though he gives an account of the proſelyting of the Idumeans by HYRCANUS. Indeed on this occaſion, he mentions only circumciſion as the rite of initiation; and ſaith, that upon receiving this rite, and living according to the Jewiſh law, they from that time became Jews. And notwithſtanding he ſpeaks of John's baptiſm, yet it is under a very different notion from the Proſelyte baptiſm ſpoken of by the Miſhnical Rabbies. *This good man*, ſaith he, *did* HEROD *kill, who exhorted the virtuous, juſt, and pious, to come to his baptiſm; for he looked upon baptiſm to be acceptable to God, when uſed, not for purging away certain offences, but for purifying the body, the ſoul having been before cleanſed by righteouſneſs*. So that he makes John's baptiſm to be of the nature of the Jewiſh purifications, or ceremonial waſhings, without having any reference to Proſelyte baptiſm; which, on this occaſion, he could hardly have failed mentioning, if it had been then in uſe. It is alledged, however, in favour of its antiquity, That it is mentioned by ARRIAN, who lived A. D. 150. for ſpeaking of a philoſopher's obligation to act agreeably to his character, he hath this illuſtration: *If we ſee any one change his profeſſion*, (or become a Jew,) *we do not*

for

for that reaſon ſtile him a Jew, but regard him as an hypocrite. Yet when he diſcovers the diſpoſition and manners of one who is baptized, του βεβαμμενου, *and inliſted in that ſect, then he both is, and is called a Jew.* But to this it is replied, That nothing was more common, than for the Heathens to confound the Jews and Chriſtians *. Even FESTUS, who governed for ſome time in Judea, ſeems to have taken the Chriſtians only for a ſect of the Jews, Acts xxv. 19, 20. SUETONIUS ſpeaks of an inſurrection made by the Jews *impulſore Chreſto*. And it is moſt likely, that ARRIAN meant Chriſtians in the place alledged; becauſe in his time many perſons became proſelytes to Chriſtianity, but few or none to Judaiſm, the Jews who were ſcattered amongſt all nations, being every where oppreſſed and deſpiſed. Beſides, if he had ſpoke of Proſelytes to Judaiſm, it is highly probable he would have mentioned their *circumciſion*, for which the Heathens derided them, rather than their baptiſm, which was not ſo very foreign to ſome of the heathen rites of purification. Upon the whole, it is more likely the Jews took the hint of Proſelyte baptiſm, after our Saviour's time, than that he borrowed his baptiſm from theirs; which, whenever it came into practice, was one of thoſe *additions* to the law of God, which he *ſeverely cenſures*, Mat. xv. 9.—There wants more evidence of its being as ancient as our Saviour's time, than I apprehend can be produced, to ground any argument upon it in relation to Chriſtian baptiſm." *Jewiſh Antiquities*, B. I. C. III. Vol. I. p. 135—138.

9. Dr. BENSON: "As I am not fully ſatisfied about that fact, [the Jewiſh cuſtom of initiating Heathen proſelytes by baptiſm] I would propoſe my difficulties, with a view to excite others to a further inquiry into that particular. (1) I have not, in the Old

* Vid. OWENI *Theologoum*. L. I. C. IX. p. 105. See alſo Mr. HENRY and Dr. DODDRIDGE on Acts xviii. 2.

Old Teſtament, found any inſtance of one perſon's waſhing another, by way of conſecration, purification, or ſanctification; except that of Moſes his waſhing Aaron and his ſons, when he ſet them apart unto the office of prieſts, Lev. viii. 6. (2) I cannot find that the Jews do at preſent practiſe any ſuch thing, as that of baptizing the proſelytes that go over to them; though they are ſaid to make them waſh themſelves. (3) Where is there any intimation of ſuch a practice among the Jews before the coming of our Lord? If any one could produce any clear teſtimony of that kind from the Old Teſtament, the Apochrypha, JOSEPHUS, or PHILO; that would be of great moment. (4) In former times, proſelytes, coming over from Heatheniſm to the Jewiſh religion, uſed to waſh themſelves; which is a very different thing from baptiſm, or perſons being waſhed by another—I do not abſolutely deny, that the Jews initiated proſelytes by baptiſm,—but I mention theſe difficulties and objections, with regard to that fact." *Paraphraſe and Notes on Epiſt. of Paul*, p. 641, 642. Edit. 2d.

Note. To the preceding authors I may add, ZELTNERUS, who derives "the firſt origin of an initiatory baptiſm among the Jews, from the office of John the Baptiſt *;" and PFEIFFERUS, who ſays, "We think that the compariſon which LIGHTFOOT forms, between proſelyte baptiſm and the ſacrament of initiation for Chriſtians, ſhould be admitted *cum* MAGNO GRANO *ſalis* †." WERNSDORFIUS wrote profeſſedly againſt the derivation of Chriſtian baptiſm from the ſuppoſed proſelyte bathing ‡; and CARPZOVIUS, if I miſtake not, induced by the arguments of WERNSDORF, gives up the high antiquity

* Apud WOLFIUM, *Curæ*, ad Mat. iii. 6. † *Antiq. Ebraicæ*. C. I. § 5. ‡ Vid. FABRICII *Hiſt. Biblioth. Fabrician.* Tom. IV. p. 452.

quity of proſelyte baptiſm*: but, not having an opportunity of conſulting either of thoſe learned works, I cannot preſent the Reader with any quotations from them.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. By theſe teſtimonies of learned Pædobaptiſts we are taught, That the Jewiſh proſelyte baptiſm was rather a *civil* than a *religious* rite. See No. 4, 5.—That the Rabbies themſelves were *divided* about the neceſſity of it. See No. 6.—That its adminiſtration was confined to *proſelytes*, and to ſuch children as were born *prior* to the incorporation of their parents with the Jewiſh church. See No. 4, 5. 8.—That the earlieſt accounts of this baptiſm are contained in the Talmuds. See No. 7, 8.—That there is no evidence of ſuch a rite being adminiſtered to proſelytes in the time of our Lord, but ſtrong preſumptive proof to the contrary. See No. 1. 5, 6. 8.—That ſuppoſing there was a cuſtom of this kind, it muſt be conſidered as *totally deſtitute* of divine authority, as a tradition of the fathers, and as very ſeverely cenſured by our Lord himſelf. See No. 8.—That it is abſurd to imagine our divine Legiſlator ſhould challenge to himſelf *all authority in heaven and on earth*, when going to recommend *a human invention*, which had been annexed to an antiquated ſyſtem. See No. 1.—And, therefore, that the derivation of Chriſtian baptiſm from the Jews, is deſtitute of *all probability* and a *wild imagination*. See No. 1. 6, 7, 8.

REFLECT. II. By the quotations produced it plainly appears, that the Baptiſts are not the only perſons who deny that venerable antiquity of proſelyte baptiſm for which ſo many plead; and that they are far from being led by mere hypotheſis to reject the

* CARPZOV. *Antiq. Judaicæ*, Lipſ. 1748.

the Rabbinical rite, as having no connection with the Chriſtian ordinance now before us. It is worthy of remark alſo, that the moſt learned defenders of this Talmudical bathing, are greatly divided about the antiquity and origin of it. SCHICKARD and MEYER imagine, that it was adopted by the Jews out of an averſion to the Samaritans*. Sir JOHN MARSHAM ſuppoſes, that it was begun by the Iſraelites in imitation of the Egyptians, in regard to their manner of initiation into the myſteries of their goddeſs Iſis†. With him Dr. SPENCER agrees, who thinks that the Jews received it from the neighbouring nations, that uſually prepared candidates for the more ſacred functions of their idolatrous religion, by a ſolemn ablution. So, it was cuſtomary among the Egyptians, Perſians, Greeks, Romans, and others, for thoſe that were to be initiated into their myſteries, or ſacred rites, to be firſt purified by dipping their whole body in water‡. SPERLING conſiders the baptiſm of ancient Heathens, before the time of Moſes, as a kind of introduction to it§. HEIDEGGER and LIGHTFOOT fix its commencement in the time of Jacob‖. GROTIUS imagines it commenced immediately after the deluge, in commemoration of the world being purified by water**. RHENFERD carries it up to the time of our father Adam††. Mr. DORRINGTON ſuppoſes it was "appointed by God, *in the beginning*;" and that "it is a rite belonging to the *old religion* of the world‡‡." Such is the *honourable* origin,

* Apud PFEIFFER. *Antiq. Ebraicæ*, C. 1. § 5.
† In Dr. GILL's *Diſſert. on Bap. of Jewiſh Proſ.* Chap. V.
‡ In *Encyclopæd. Britan.* Vol. II. Art. BAPTISM.
§ In Dr. GILL, as above, p. 91. ‖ HEIDEGG. *Corp. Theolog.* Tom. II. p. 437. LIGHTFOOT, in POLI *Synopſ.* ad Mat. iii. 6. ** Apud POLUM, ut ſupra. †† In Dr. GILL, as before, p. 63. ‡‡ *Vindicat. of the Chriſt. Church in Baptiz. Inf.* p. 37.

origin, and ſuch the *high* antiquity, of the baptiſmal rite! What ideas theſe things may excite in my Reader, I cannot pretend to ſay; but they remind me of claims advanced by defenders of the Monaſtic life, to the hoary antiquity of that practice. Some of them are contented to conſider JOHN the Baptiſt, as the firſt perſon of the Monkiſh order. Others, not ſatisfied with an idea of the inſtitution being ſo *novel*, fix on ELIJAH as the founder of that fraternity. Others, diſdaining ſuch a comparatively *modern* date, go back beyond the flood, and claim the illuſtrious ENOCH, as the reverend father of the whole brotherhood. While others aſcend to our firſt parents in *paradiſe*, and conſider ADAM as a Monk, and EVE as a Nun*.

REFLECT. III. Various particulars, recorded by the Evangeliſts, render it improbable that the Jews had any ſuch baptiſm in thoſe times. For inſtance: John, the ſon of Zacharias, was diſtinguiſhed among his countrymen by the name of THE BAPTIST, on account of his *immerſing* proſelytes to the faith he preached. This, doubtleſs, wears the appearance of *proſelyte* baptiſm being intirely a new practice; and is a preſumptive evidence, that the Jews had no ſuch cuſtom among them in thoſe times.—*The baptiſm of John*, ſays our Lord, *was it from heaven, or of men? Anſwer me*, Mark xi. 30, 31, 32. Now had it been, as many of our Brethren ſuppoſe, a well known cuſtom before our Saviour's time, to baptize proſelytes; it would have been eaſy for thoſe prieſts, and ſcribes, and elders, to have replied; "It was *from men*. It originated among *our fathers* before John was born." For, ſuppoſing the venerable John to have received a divine

* HOSPINIANUS *de Monachis*, L. II. C. III. F. FABRICII *Chriſt. Fundament. Eccleſ.* p. 445. *Vita* HOSPINIANI, præfixa Operibus.

divine commiſſion to *adminiſter* that inſtitution; yet the *rite itſelf*, on the hypotheſis of our opponents, was *of men*. But the Jews, not being able to aſſert any ſuch thing, without expoſing themſelves to the charge of a notorious falſehood, were quite confounded: for there is no reaſon to think, that they were apprehenſive of being ſtoned, barely for ſpeaking a well known truth; as their proſelyte baptiſm muſt have been, had it been an eſtabliſhed practice.—Again: Baptiſm is called the *counſel of God*, Luke vii. 29, 30. But, had it been practiſed in the admiſſion of proſelytes before the miniſtry of John commenced, it could not have been ſo denominated, becauſe it would have been the *device of men*; for none of our Brethren, ſo far as I have obſerved, pretend to demonſtrate the divine inſtitution of this Jewiſh initiatory bathing.

As there is no appearance, in the New Teſtament, of this proſelyte baptiſm, but ſtrong preſumptive proof to the contrary; ſo Dr. GILL, who was well verſed in both Jewiſh and Chriſtian antiquity, unites with Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL, No. 6, in aſſuring us, That there is no mention of it in any of the Fathers, for the firſt three or four hundred years; or in the writings of thoſe who flouriſhed before the Talmuds were compiled *.—The following quotations from TERTULLIAN, by Mr. BARKER, and his remark upon them, deſerve regard. "Before the Lord's ſuffering, ſays the African Father, forgiveneſs was by faith alone;—but when faith was encreaſed—baptiſm was *added*—The pool of Bethesda, —the figure of the bodily remedy *repreſented* the ſpiritual one:—the waters of the flood by which the old wickedneſs was waſhed away;—the people going out

* Dr. GILL's *Diſſert. on Proſelyte Bap.* p. 47.

out of Egypt paſſed through the water,—a *figure* of baptiſm:—the water was healed of its bitterneſs by wood:—the water which flowed out of the rock,—Chriſt himſelf was baptiſed—The Gentiles—are initiated to ſome ſacred rites by waſhing;—purify houſes, temples, and whole cities by ſprinkling;—and among the ancients he who was accuſed of murder, purged himſelf by water—We ſee the aim of the devil *imitating* the things of God, when he uſes a *baptiſm* on his worſhippers." Thus TERTULLIAN: on which Mr. BARKER obſerves, as follows. "The Fathers are fond of finding any thing *like* baptiſm among the Jews, and imagine imitations of it among the Heathens, often when the likeneſs was without deſign, as in JUSTIN MARTYR, as well as here. But though they have brought in all they can find, right or wrong; there is not a word of any ſuppoſed Jewiſh *proſelyte* baptiſm, which would have been more ſimilar than any of them; whence it is plain to me, they knew of no ſuch thing: on the contrary, he [TERTULLIAN] here ſpeaks of baptiſm, as a thing which *began with*, and was *peculiar to*, Chriſtianity. The Gentile rites, in my mind, are not imitations of baptiſm, but of the Jewiſh purifications *."—On a deliberate and impartial ſurvey of the caſe, we may, therefore, ſafely conclude; That the Papiſts and Lutherans have much better evidence, with regard to antiquity, in favour of *exorciſm*, than any which can be produced for the Jewiſh *proſelyte baptiſm*. For, as a learned Lutheran, when ſpeaking of the *former*, ſays; "It is a very ancient rite, and was practiſed among the Jews in the time of Chriſt; who are ſaid to have uſed it in expelling demons, Luke xi. 19. Acts xix. iii.—Exorciſm alſo, in a very early age, began

* *Duty and Benefits of Bap.* p. 89, 90.

began to be connected with the ſacrament of baptiſm, as is teſtified by CYPRIAN*."

REFLECT. IV. But ſuppoſing it were inconteſtibly proved, that the Jews had ſuch a cuſtom before the miniſtry of John commenced; it would by no means follow, that our Lord paid it any *regard* in the appointment of Chriſtian baptiſm, and that for ſeveral reaſons. For, if he made that initiatory rite the model of his own appointment; and if a knowledge of the *former* be of great uſe to underſtand who are intereſted in the *latter*, as many Pædobaptiſts pretend; that information muſt be obtained, either from what our divine Teacher ſays in the New Teſtament, or from the traditions and records of the Jews. But our Lord ſays not a word about any ſuch thing, in all his New Teſtament. There we find baptiſm repeatedly mentioned, appointed, practiſed, and the deſign of it explained; but nothing at all relating to this proſelyte baptiſm. If, therefore, we obtain the uſeful intelligence about it, ſo as to help us in ſettling who are the ſubjects of our Sovereign's appointment, it muſt be by having recourſe to the Jewiſh ſynagogue. Now is it not—let common ſenſe determine—is it not far more probable, that Chriſt intended his *own commiſſion* for the obſervance of baptiſm, as the *only law* of adminiſtration, and the practice of his Apoſtles as the *only example* for his people to follow; than that he ſhould leave either its mode or ſubjects, to be learned from the traditions of an *apoſtate* people, or the records of their admired but *impious Talmuds* †? Can it be imagined, that our Lord ſhould appoint baptiſm for *all* his diſciples; that the bulk of his followers, in every age, ſhould

* DEYLINGIUS *de Prudentia Paſtoral.* Pars III. C. III. § 27. † Vid. WITSIUM, *Judæus Chriſtianizans*, Cap. IV.

ſhould be *very illiterate*; that he ſhould give them a *body* of doctrine and a *code* of law in his New Teſtament; and, after all this, that he ſhould *tacitly refer* them to the writings of his enemies—thoſe writings, which are the regiſters of their own pride, and madneſs, and ſhame—writings too, of which, perhaps, a great majority of Chriſtians never *heard*, nor had it in their *power* to read—in order to learn, *whom he intended to be baptized?* See CHAP. VIII. REFLECT. III.

Again: It is generally agreed by theological writers, if I miſtake not, that Sir JOHN MARSHAM and Dr. SPENCER have not only erred from the truth, but greatly *diſhonoured* the Jewiſh OEconomy, by maintaining, that *circumciſion*, and various other poſitive rites, were adopted by Jehovah from the *Egyptian ſacra:* becauſe that hypotheſis naturally tends to ennoble the Pagan ſuperſtition, and to depreciate the Moſaic ſyſtem of worſhip, with which thoſe borrowed rites are ſuppoſed to have been incorporated. "But who, as DEYLINGIUS obſerves, who can believe that the moſt holy God appointed to Abraham, for a ſign of the covenant, an *Egyptian* rite, deviſed by the accurſed poſterity of Ham; and that he ſo ſeverely injoined it, under a capital puniſhment, on his own people, who were choſen for his peculiar, and for the purſuit of holineſs, above all the nations of the earth *?" Now if the opinion, that circumciſion was originally taken from an ancient Heathen practice, and appointed by Jehovah for the uſe of his own people, be *degrading* to the Hebrew ritual; it cannot be for the honour of Chriſtianity to imagine, that the firſt of its poſitive ordinances was originally *a human invention*, and borrowed of the *ſuperſtitious Jews:* the generality of whom were as hardened oppoſers of

* *Obſervat. Sac.* Pars II. Obſerv. VI. § 2. Vid. WITSII *Egyptiac*, L. III. C. VI. § 1, 2.

of Jeſus Chriſt, and as inimical to the intereſts of his kingdom, as any of the Heathens were to the glory of Jehovah, or the welfare of his choſen people. From various particulars recorded in the Evangelical hiſtory there is reaſon to think, that the ſcribes, and phariſees, and prieſts, and elders of thoſe times, were not much ſuperior to the Rabbies of Tiberias in a following age, of whom Dr. LIGHTFOOT ſays: "Recollect, I beſeech you, the names of the Rabbins of Tiberias, from the firſt ſituation of the univerſity there, to the time that it expired; and what, at length, do you find, but a kind of men mad with Phariſaiſm, bewitching with traditions, and bewitched, blind, guileful, doting, they muſt pardon me if I ſay, magical and monſtrous?—Read over the Jeruſalem Talmud, and ſee there how R. JUDAH, R. CHANINAH, &c. and the reſt of the grand doctors among the Rabbins of Tiberias behave themſelves; how earneſtly they do nothing; how childiſhly they handle ſerious matters; how much of ſophiſtry, froth, poiſon, ſmoke, nothing at all there is in their diſputes*!" Now is it likely that our divine Lord would make a ceremony which originated in the ignorance and ſuperſtition of *ſuch* men, the ground or model of a Chriſtian ordinance? *Credat Judæus apella.* With equal propriety might the Jews have concurred with CELSUS the Heathen, in repreſenting circumciſion as derived from the idolatrous Egyptians†; as Chriſtians compliment the unbelieving Jews by confeſſing, that baptiſm was borrowed of their ſuperſtitious forefathers.

Further: Admitting this Rabbinical rite was practiſed in the time of our Lord, it is, notwithſtanding

* *Works*, Vol. II. p. 73. † ORIGINES *Contra* CELSUM, L. I. p. 17. Edit. SPENCER.

ing, highly unreaſonable to conſider it as a rule of adminiſtering Chriſtian baptiſm. For, if a rule, it muſt be either *partial* or *complete*. That it is the *latter*, Pædobaptiſts do not pretend. It muſt be treated, therefore, as a *partial* rule; a rule with *certain limitations*. How far, then, and in what reſpects, muſt it be applied? To the *mode*, or the *ſubjects*, or the *circumſtances*, or the *effects*, of the ordinance? If, to the *mode*; not pouring or ſprinkling, but *immerſion* muſt be conſtantly uſed: it being notorious, and allowed on all hands, that the Jewiſh proſelyte baptiſm was not any thing ſhort of *dipping* in water. If to the *ſubjects*; then it will follow, that no *uncircumciſed* male is qualified for baptiſm; that it muſt not be adminiſtered to a child, with which the mother was *pregnant* at the time of her own baptiſm; and that the *firſt converts* from Judaiſm, Mohammedaniſm, or Paganiſm, but not any of their future offspring, ſhould be baptized. If to the *circumſtances* of adminiſtration; then it will follow, that baptiſm, to render it valid, muſt be performed in the preſence of *three* witneſſes, who are men of eminence; that perſons may *baptize themſelves*; that it muſt not be adminiſtered, either on the *ſabbath*, or on a ſuppoſed *holy day*, or in the *night*. If to the *effects* of the ordinance, then, as repreſented by the Jews, the party baptized is like a *new born infant*; he receives a *new ſoul*; all his former connections are *diſſolved*, and the obligations ariſing from them are *annihilated*; ſo that, without the leaſt imputation of a criminal kind, he may contract matrimony with his own *ſiſter*, his *daughter*, or his *mother**.—Now to *which* of theſe particulars will Chriſtian

* See Mr. EMLYN's *Previous Queſtion*. Dr. JOHN GALE's *Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 218—230. Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Introduct. p. 51. 57. and Dr. GILL's *Diſſert. on Proſ. Bap.* Chap. V.

Chriſtian baptiſm apply? Or, *how far* is the rule ſuggeſted, by this Jewiſh cuſtom, to be regarded in adminiſtering our Lord's appointment? That it ſhould have *ſome* regard, the generality of our Brethren maintain; inſiſting upon it, that our Divine Legiſlator was *leſs explicit* in what he ſaid concerning baptiſm, becauſe it was frequently practiſed in thoſe times*. According to them, therefore, it is of real and great importance to know, *what* that Jewiſh ceremony was; to *whom* adminiſtered; with what *circumſtances*; and with what *expectations*. Theſe things, however, we cannot learn, except from the writings of the Jews themſelves; and thoſe records contain the preceding intelligence concerning theſe particulars. If, then, the proſelyte baptiſm ſtand in ſo cloſe a connection with Chriſtian baptiſm, as our opponents maintain; and if the *former*, be at all a direction for the adminiſtration of the *latter*; it muſt be ſo *invariably*, as far as that direction extends: becauſe, on this principle, Jeſus Chriſt had ſuch a reſpect for that Jewiſh ceremony, as tacitly to remit his followers to it, as a *comment* on his own inſtitution.

But ſtill we ſeem at a loſs for that *degree* of regard which is due to this example of the ancient Synagogue; Chriſt and his Apoſtles being *ſilent*, *intirely* ſilent about it. For any thing which they have ſaid concerning the Rabbinical rite, it may be a *complete* rule in reference to Chriſtian baptiſm, and binding in *every particular*. Who, then, ſhall take upon him to ſay, "*Thus far* the Jewiſh example operates: *hither* the rule ſuggeſted by it extends and is binding;—*but no further?*" With what appearance of reaſon, or of authority, do any ſelect *one* particular, in

* Dr. WALL, ut ſupra, p. 56, 57.

in preference to many others, in which the two rites are ſuppoſed to coincide; and then argue from the *Jewiſh* to *Chriſtian* baptiſm, with reference to that *ſingle* point? Such a procedure is far from treating the proſelyte baptiſm as a *rule* of underſtanding our Lord's commiſſion, and of directing our conduct in compliance with it: for it is only accommodating, according to our own inclination, a particular fact, detached from many others, with which it is cloſely connected. Whoever believes that our Lord expreſſed his mind more conciſely, in relation to baptiſm, than he would have done, had not this Jewiſh rite then exiſted; ſhould certainly pay a more impartial regard to what the Rabbies have ſaid concerning their initiatory ceremony: for the conduct of our oppoſers, in this reſpect, ſeems calculated merely to ſerve a purpoſe; and proves nothing ſo much, as *their want* of argument from divine Revelation.

Our opponents have often ſuggeſted, that the Jewiſh proſelyte bathing, in the time of our Lord, ſuperſeded the neceſſity of an *expreſs command* for Infant baptiſm. But might not the Papiſts and Lutherans as well ſay; There was no need of Chriſt giving an expreſs command for *exorciſm*, ſeeing it was practiſed among the Jews in the time of his public miniſtry?—Suppoſing, however, that what is pretended were granted; we ſhould ſtill be at a loſs to account for the want of a *plain example*. If our Brethren be right, not only the Penmen of the New Teſtament, but all the twelve Apoſtles, all the ſeventy Diſciples, and all the apoſtolic Miniſters were Pædobaptiſts. Now, if thoſe venerable men eſpouſed the ſentiment and practiſed the ceremony againſt which we here contend, the baptiſm of infants muſt

have been *very common* among them: and yet, common as it was, on that ſuppoſition, it is not ſo much as *once* mentioned in the Records of inſpiration. Muſt we, then, conſider that ſame Jewiſh bathing, as having rendered a *precedent* for Pædobaptiſm quite unneceſſary, and as having tacitly forbidden the ſacred Writers to ſay a word about it? Had the Rabbinical baptiſm then exiſted, and had our divine Legiſlator, together with the Apoſtles, as publiſhers of his laws, paid it ſuch a regard, we might well have wondered: nay, we might have had reaſon to execrate that invention of an apoſtate people, as being the occaſion of ſo much darkneſs attending a New Teſtament rite; in which the diſciples of Chriſt are deeply intereſted. But while we conclude that our gracious Lord was more concerned, when enacting the law of baptiſm, *expreſſly* to command the *whole* of what he required, than to dignify a human invention; and while we believe that the Apoſtles, when writing under his direction, were far from *omitting* an important fact, becauſe, at ſome time or other, the collectors of Jewiſh fables would *ſupply* that deficiency; we muſt maintain, that the want of both precept and precedent for Infant baptiſm, is an *eſſential* defect attending the cauſe of our oppoſers. We may venture to add, that every endeavour to ſupply that deficiency, by appealing to a Rabbinical cuſtom, is little ſhort of a libel on the legiſlative character of Jeſus Chriſt, and a reflection on the inſpired hiſtoric pen. For, of whatever uſe Jewiſh authors or Heathen claſſics may be, to elucidate words and phraſes in the ſacred Volume; we ought never to conſider what they ſay, as conſtituting any part of *the rule*, by which an ordinance of divine worſhip ſhould be performed: becauſe

cauſe that would be to place them on the throne of legiſlation. We may, therefore, conclude, that if this Talmudical bathing be the *true* baſis of Infant baptiſm, as Dr. HAMMOND ſuggeſts*; it has but a ſandy foundation, and threatens an opprobrious fall.

SECT. II.

External Covenant Relation.

MR. JONATHAN EDWARDS: "I know the diſtinction that is made by ſome, between the *internal* and *external* covenant; but I hope the divines that make this diſtinction, would not be underſtood, that there are really and properly *two* covenants of grace; but only that thoſe who profeſs the one only covenant of grace, are of two ſorts: there are thoſe who comply with it *internally* and really; and others who do ſo only *externally*, that is, in profeſſion and viſibility—There is alſo this diſtinction takes place concerning the covenant of grace: the one only covenant of grace is exhibited two ways; the one *externally* by the preaching of the word; the other *internally* and ſpiritually, by enlightening the mind rightly to underſtand the word—But the New Teſtament affords no more foundation for ſuppoſing two real and properly diſtinct covenants of grace, than it does to ſuppoſe two ſorts of real Chriſtians." *Inquiry into Qalifications for full Commun. in the Church*, p. 30. Boſton, 1749.

2. VITRINGA: "Divines, who urge Pædobaptiſm, are wont commonly to ſuppoſe, that the covenant of grace is *internal* and *external*. They will have believers only, to be partakers of the *internal* covenant; but of the *external*, even unbelievers and reprobates,

* In Dr. GILL's *Diſſert. on Bap. of Proſelytes*, p. 18.

reprobates, who externally give up their names to the church. To this *external* covenant alſo belongs the adminiſtration of the ſacraments; which are, as it were, ſymbols and badges, by which Chriſtians are diſtinguiſhed from Heathens and profane perſons. They who are admitted to this external covenant of grace, enjoy this prerogative, that both themſelves and their children *are holy*; ſo that their children may be baptized: and, on the contrary, that the children of infidels ought to be excluded from baptiſm. Thus ESSENIUS, thus the Dutch Interpreters, and others of our Reformed doctors, not a few——But I do not think, that there is any ſuch external covenant of grace, under the New OEconomy, as that which learned men commonly lay for the foundation of Pædobaptiſm; and as this is an article of ſome importance, we will a little enlarge upon it.

"Now ſeeing the matter of every covenant, which God makes with man, intirely conſiſts in *precepts* and *promiſes*; I deſire to be informed, by thoſe who maintain this opinion, what God *ſtipulates* in the external covenant of grace, what he *commands*, what he *promiſes*, what are the *conditions*, and what the *benefits* of that external covenant about which they ſpeak? ſeeing in theſe the whole covenant, as to the matter of it, conſiſts. Certainly, no other *precept* is expreſſed in the records of the New Teſtament, in reference to this affair, than that which is briefly comprehended in thoſe words, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; nor any other *promiſe* added to the precept of the covenant, than is included in thoſe words, *And thou ſhalt be ſaved and thy houſe*. And when God requires *faith* of any man, he at the ſame time demands a *profeſſion of the mouth*; but no other than that which is connected with

with the aſſent of the *heart* and of a *good conſcience*, which the Holy Spirit calls, *truth in the reins*; that is, *in the inward parts*; *love*; *a new heart*; *a new ſpirit*; *a heart of fleſh*; and *purity of heart*——That *faith*, therefore, which God requires, when he enters into covenant with a ſinner, under the New OEconomy, hath its reſidence in the *heart* of a ſinner; whence alſo it is called *repentance:* and that *profeſſion* of faith, which is made by words and actions, is not required by the Lord, except from thoſe who *really believe*. For a *confeſſion to ſalvation* is not made *with the mouth*, except when *the heart believeth unto righteouſneſs*. Nor can it be, that he *who believes in Chriſt*, ſhould not profeſs the name of Chriſt, in his actions and courſe of life; that is, by being zealous of true virtue, he will ſignify that *he belongs to Chriſt*, becauſe true faith exerts itſelf by love. Whereas, therefore, there is no other *precept* of the New Covenant than that of *faith* and *repentance*; we thence infer, that the covenant which God makes with miſerable man, under the New OEconomy, is in this reſpect *internal*, if you love ſo to ſpeak, and *ſpiritual*.

"But becauſe the ſacraments chiefly regard the *promiſes* of the covenant, of which they are uſually appendages and ſeals; it is proper to conſider, whether the promiſes of the covenant be of the *ſame nature*, with its precepts. Now all the promiſes of the New Covenant are propoſed to us in that well known and remarkable paſſage, Jeremiah xxxi. 33, 34. Compare Heb. viii. 10, 11, 12. 2 Cor. vi. 8. The ſame promiſes are repeated in Ezekiel. The Apoſtle calls thoſe benefits, *righteouſneſs*, *peace*, *and joy in the Holy Ghoſt*. Many other phraſes of a ſimilar kind, that we omit, occur in Moſes and the Prophets.

phets. It is doubtleſs very evident, from this paſſage of Jeremiah, in which all the bleſſings of the New Covenant are comprehended; that all the *promiſes* of the New Covenant regard *ſpiritual* bleſſings. *Writing the law on the heart; to have God for their God; a rich knowledge of divine things; forgiveneſs of ſins; and liberty,* thence ariſing, from every kind of ſlavery; are benefits of ſuch a nature as pertain to the better part of man, which is capable of ſpiritual, of celeſtial, and of everlaſting bleſſings. Hence the Apoſtle ſays, that the *promiſes of the New Covenant* are *more excellent* than thoſe of the Old OEconomy, Heb. viii. 6: becauſe that which is *ſpiritual* and *eternal*, as are the promiſes of the New Covenant, excels that which is *corporal* and *periſhing*—If, therefore, neither the *precepts* of the New Covenant, nor the *promiſes*, which, on the part of God, conſtitute the nature of the covenant, are any other than *ſpiritual*, and of *ſpiritual bleſſings*; I ſee no other covenant exiſting under the New OEconomy, than that which is *internal*; in which none but *true believers* are intereſted, on whoſe minds the divine law is inſcribed: that is, their ſpirits are excited by the Spirit of God, to the love of God in Chriſt.

"The *ſacraments* of the New Covenant evince the ſame thing; for they are of ſuch a nature as to ſeal nothing but what is *ſpiritual*, nor to be of any advantage, except in regard to thoſe that *really believe in Jeſus Chriſt*. What *baptiſm* ſignifies and ſeals, Paul declares in his Epiſtle to the Romans, when he elegantly ſays; *We are buried with him by baptiſm into death; that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead to the glory of the Father, ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeneſs of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſs*

likeneſs of his reſurrection. Baptiſm, therefore, ſignifies and ſeals the death of the body of ſin, and a reſurrection from that death; which is effected, partly in this life, partly in the future reſurrection, and that in virtue of the death and reſurrection of Chriſt. This comprehends the whole nature of baptiſm. By *eating* bread and *drinking* wine, in the Lord's ſupper, is repreſented and ſealed our communion with the death and obedience of Chriſt, as the cauſe of eternal life and joy. This it is, *to eat the fleſh and drink the blood of the Son of man.* Here we meet with nothing that is not *ſpiritual.* Whence, again, I prove, that the covenant of grace is no other, after ſin was expiated on the croſs of Chriſt, than internal and ſpiritual; becauſe the ſacraments of that *covenant ſignify and ſeal nothing but what is ſpiritual.* The conſequence of which is, that the ſacraments profit none beſides true believers, and that none but thoſe who poſſeſs a ſanctified mind by faith, have a right to uſe or enjoy them—If, therefore, the ſacraments belong to none but true believers; and if they are of no advantage to any beſides thoſe who truly believe; what is the reaſon of maintaining a *covenant*, or the *external communion* of a covenant, to which pertains the adminiſtration of ſacraments, ſeeing the adminiſtration of ſacraments preſuppoſes *faith*, which is the condition of the internal covenant? The whole, therefore, of this *external covenant* falls: all its *prerogatives* alſo fall, of whatever kind they are imagined to be; and among them alſo, the BAPTISM OF INFANTS, if, as is commonly thought, it muſt be derived from this fountain.

"I confeſs, indeed, that there was an *external* and *carnal* covenant under the Old OEconomy, beſides an internal and ſpiritual covenant which flouriſhed

riſhed under the ſame Diſpenſation. Nor do I deny, that circumciſion, the paſſover, and the legal ſacrifices, were ſubſervient to that covenant, inſtead of ſacraments. But I would have it remembered, that the ſtate of things was *far different* in thoſe ancient, from what it is in theſe modern times. All merely carnal and external things in religion, as performed under the New OEconomy, are aboliſhed. Nothing remains there, but *ſpirit and truth*. The covenant which God now makes with miſerable man, is *merely ſpiritual*. Nothing now is known, judged, or eſteemed, *according to the fleſh*." *Obſervat. Sac.* L. II. C. VI. § 13. 15—18. Tom. I. p. 320—324.

3. VENEMA: "That there is a twofold aſpect of the covenant of grace, as alſo of the church of Chriſt our Lord, the one interior, and the other exterior, I make no doubt: but ſo, as *that* conſtitutes its internal form, which includes its eſſence; and *this* expreſſes its external form or appearance, by which the covenant is ſhewed and declared. The covenant of grace has its ſeat in the heart; comprehends laws and bleſſings that are ſpiritual; and is confirmed by a true and living faith. This is its eſſential form; this is its nature; this is, properly, the covenant of grace; and he who thus enters into the covenant, is properly called a *federate* of God, or one that is in covenant with him. But ſeeing a man is converſant among men, and certain rites obtain that publicly exhibit and ſeal the covenant made between God and man; hence it puts on an external appearance, by which the covenant entered into is declared and confirmed. The covenant is *one* and *the ſame*; but internally made, externally ſhewing itſelf; eſtabliſhed, by faith implanted in the heart; expreſſed, by external works and rites. The one, is the *making* of the covenant;

covenant; the other, a *diſcovery* of it. The former, is the *covenant*; the latter, is an external *demonſtration* of it; and the name of a covenant properly agrees, not to *this*, but to *that*. When any one believes with the heart, he is in the covenant of grace; when he profeſſes with the mouth, and performs external rites, he expoſes to view that which is in his heart, and externally repreſents the covenant of grace—If a perſon does not really believe; if the interior form of the covenant be wanting; if he merely confeſs with the mouth, without believing in his heart; if he uſe the ſacraments only in an external manner, without faith and piety; he exhibits, indeed, the *appearance* of the covenant, yet the *covenant itſelf* he does not poſſeſs, nor lawfully takes, but ſnatches the *appearance* of it. He boaſts of it, not really but feignedly; is not cloathed with his own, but with a foreign garment, which, contrary to reaſon and right, he ſtole. He appears not in his own perſon, but falſly in one that is foreign; he does not, therefore, expreſs the covenant of grace, whereas he truly has it not; nor is in the covenant of grace, except feignedly and falſly.

"From the difference between the former and the preſent OEconomy it will clearly appear, that the genius of the New Teſtament is abhorrent from an *external* covenant. The perſon, or character, which God before adopted, agreeing to ſuch a covenant, exhibits to view an *external king*, as we have before ſeen; but the King of the church, who has fixed his throne in the heavens, who will be adored in a celeſtial manner, in ſpirit and in truth, and chiefly worſhipped with the heart, has intirely laid that character aſide. For his *kingdom is in the midſt of us*; it *is not of this world*; but is, as every where called,

the kingdom of heaven. It is not agreeable to this Perſon, to have an *external people*; it does not become him to be called, the GOD *of a nation* that are diſaffected to him in their hearts, by which name Jehovah was called under the Old Teſtament—All the Iſraelites, as many as were born of Iſrael and circumciſed, were, without any difference, members of the divine covenant; but *now* we enter into the covenant of grace, not by *birth*, but by *faith*. The name of *covenantees* is no where given to baptized perſons that are deſtitute of faith; ſeeing it is not lawful even to *baptize* any one, if he be not *really a believer*, Acts viii. 37. For, not they who ſay, *Lord, Lord*, but thoſe that *perform the will of God*, are called the people of Chriſt.

"If we conſider the *laws* of the external covenant, under the Ancient OEconomy, and that *obſervance* of them which was required; a very great and excellent difference will offer itſelf to our view, which cuts the very ſinews of ſuch a covenant under the New OEconomy. There was not only then a place, and that a principal one, for *ceremonial* laws, which now, by the conſent of all, are vaniſhed away; but even their *moral* precepts wore an external appearance, as we have before ſhewed, which was a peculiarity of that legal and external covenant. Such an obedience ſatisfied, as might be performed without love, without faith, and without purity of heart: all which things are as foreign as poſſible, from the genius of the New OEconomy. Thoſe religious rites, which now obtain, are connected with the internal covenant of grace, as ſigns and ſeals with a covenant that is ratified by them; nor have they any other uſe or end: ſo that if any one uſe them, detached from the covenant itſelf, he is neceſſarily engaged

gaged in rites that are void of all virtue, and acts in direct oppoſition to the appointment and intention of God; ſeeing, in that caſe, they do not ſeal, or confirm to a man, the covenant of grace—Our *ſacraments* do not belong to any external covenant, as under the former Diſpenſation; but to the internal covenant of grace: which poſitive rites no one can *rightly* or *lawfully uſe*, beſides a true believer, that is internally a covenantee—*Moral* laws, the performance of which exhibits itſelf to external view, have their ſeat only in the exerciſe of faith and love: for whether any one confeſs with the mouth, or actually perform certain external duties, if it be done without faith and love, he is uſually branded with a charge of hypocriſy; and Chriſt expreſſly declares that he *never knew him*, or accounted him for his own—A confeſſion of faith, without faith itſelf, is no where injoined. The uſe of the ſacraments, without union with Chriſt by faith, is required of no one—The ſacraments of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, manifeſtly comprehend, both a participation of *good*, and the exerciſe of *faith*. What is intended by the union of a man with water, into which he is immerſed? Is it not, in regard to God, the communion of that man with the obedience of Chriſt and its fruits; and, in reſpect of man, his faith, by which Chriſt is embraced? Are not theſe things clearly repreſented before our eyes, in the ordinance of baptiſm? He who eats bread and drinks wine in the holy ſupper, does he not exerciſe faith, by which he applies Chriſt to himſelf? Is not union with Chriſt, whoſe body he receives under the emblem of bread, indicated and ſealed to him?——

"It is commonly aſſerted and maintained, that infants are in the *covenant of grace*; if, however, you be

be not ſatisfied with a mere ſound, but, as becomes a lover of truth, earneſtly deſire to penetrate the real meaning, you will hardly be able to extract a conſiſtent ſenſe from the phraſe. For, either you will err from the point in hand; or affirm things that are oppoſite one to another; or betake yourſelf to another foundation to ſupport this. If, by the covenant of grace, you underſtand the *external manifeſtation* of it, call it an external covenant, aſſert that infants are members of it, and therefore to be baptized; you not only ſpeak about a *non-entity*, as is an *external* covenant, but you alſo wander far from the queſtion: for that covenant may, perhaps, give an external relation to the people of God, it may allow an external holineſs, but it cannot afford ſalvation, nor open a way to the internal benefits of grace; which, nevertheleſs, the preſent deſign requires. If you extend the *internal* covenant of grace to infants, yet you will not ſeriouſly endeavour to maintain, that *all* the infants of believers are really partakers of it; but you will ſay, experience obliging you to it, that its benefits are applied only to *ſome* of them. But is it not plain, to him who conſiders the matter, that theſe things mutually deſtroy one another? The covenant, you ſay, is made, as with Abraham and his ſeed, ſo with parents and their children; yet neither do very many children, any more than the parents, enjoy the bleſſings of the covenant. That they ſhould belong to *all* the children of believers, and be conferred only on a *few*, are things which I know not how to reconcile. Either they do not belong to all, or all participate. *All*, you ſay, according to our ſentiment, are *preſumed*, in a judgment of charity, to poſſeſs the bleſſings of grace; a *few*, in *reality*. All, by us, are to be accounted as ſuch; though in fact,

fact, there be few: but whether this diſtinction be ſufficient for the purpoſe intended, let others judge.

"If you ſay the covenant of grace belongs to *all*, according to our preſumption, you extricate yourſelf, indeed, from the charge of a contradiction; but you deſert the whole cauſe. If the covenant of grace do not belong to *all* the children of believers, to *whom* of them does it pertain? To the *elect*, the *regenerate*, the *believing* infants? or thoſe that enjoy any other *relation* or *quality?* Thus, therefore, you are obliged to ſeek for ſome other foundation to ſupport your aſſertion. You ſay, God *promiſed* to make a covenant with the infants of believers, equally as with adults. But with *all*, or with *ſome?* If the *former*, why are they not really put into the covenant? Or, ſhall a faithful God *ſay* it, and not *do* it? Shall he *promiſe* it to all, and *give* it only to a few? ſeeing there is no difference between the infants themſelves, all being placed in the ſame condition. If you prefer the *latter*; why, I aſk, reſtrain it to *ſome?*—Nor is the promiſe *ſpecial*, but *general*, comprehending all the infants of believers. The propoſal of the decree cannot be more general than the decree itſelf; for then it would not be a true, but a fallacious propoſition. And then, the promiſe that belongs to infants, is not *conditional*, but *abſolute*; ſuſpended on no condition, for that can have no place, in regard to infants. The propoſal of an abſolute promiſe cannot be *general*, and the application of it *ſpecial*. In a word, I deſire to know, by what title, and on what foundation, the covenant of grace is aſſigned to infants? Has God *promiſed* it? But the promiſe is *general*, whereas, nevertheleſs, *few* partake of it. And then, I aſk, under *what* conſideration, and *why*, God receives infants into the covenant? for ſeeing adults

adults paſs into it only by *faith*, what puts infants into it? Is it the abſolute good pleaſure of God? it is a wonder that God ſhould have reſpect only to the infants of believers; but concerning that I have treated before. Is it *faith?* but they are not capable of it; much leſs as of a condition performed from a free principle. Is it, then, *regeneration?* but that is the immediate operation of God, infants being mere patients; concerning which alſo I have ſpoken before. By what title, then, do they belong to the covenant of grace? Is it by themſelves, and in their own name, either by election, or by regeneration, or by a promiſe? but then they would be *actually partakers* of the covenant; whereas, nevertheleſs, many infants are excluded, and very few, during infancy, actually anticipate any of thoſe benefits." *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. II. C. IX. § 3. 11. 18. C. XI. § 4. C. XIII. § 6. L. III. C. II. § 2.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. As theſe great men and excellent authors have ſaid ſo much, and with ſuch force, againſt the notion of an *external* covenant under the New OEconomy, I ſhall not enlarge upon it. I would, however, preſent the Reader with a few quotations from the writings of our opponents, by which it will appear, how much they differ one from another, about the *nature* and the *degree* of that intereſt which they ſuppoſe the infants of believers have in the covenant of grace; and how *inconſiſtent* they are with themſelves, when endeavouring to prove the right of infants to baptiſm from this topic.

Mr. JOSEPH WHISTON, when handling the ſubject, ſays: "Some conceive, that the covenant is entered

entered with the ſeed of believers only *indefinitely*, and, anſwerably, that the promiſes appertaining to them, are to be interpreted and underſtood in an indefinite notion; that is, as having a reſpect to them as *generally* and *collectively* conſidered, but not made to any of them in particular. And of thoſe that go this way, ſome conceive that the covenant and promiſes appertain only to the *elect*, and ſecure to them only the future enjoyment of all the ſaving fruits and benefits purchaſed by Chriſt; but do not neceſſarily convey to, or confer upon them, any of thoſe fruits, or benefits for the preſent—But others conceive, that as the covenant and promiſes thereof have only an *indefinite* reſpect to the ſeed of believers, ſo that, at leaſt, *ſome* of them have thoſe ſaving benefits and bleſſings *actually granted to, and conferred upon them:* and, conſequently, that they are actually regenerated, and have a full and complete union with Chriſt, the remiſſion of ſins, the love and favour of God, and ſo on. And *ſome* having theſe benefits and bleſſings actually conferred upon them in their infancy, we are to preſume it may be ſo with *each one* in particular; and, on that ground, are to apply the token of the covenant to them univerſally ——Others conceive, that the covenant is entered with the ſeed of believers *definitely*, and, anſwerably, that the promiſes appertaining to them are to be interpreted and underſtood in a definite notion; and, conſequently, that as the covenant, as at firſt eſtabliſhed with Abraham, did extend to Iſhmael, as well as to Iſaac, ſo it is ſtill continued to all believers, and each one of their ſeed in particular. And ſome of theſe that go this way conceive, that *all* the infants of believers have *true grace*, in particular, *true faith*, wrought in them, either antecedent to the

the application of the token of the covenant, or at the time of its application, if not by, yet in a concurrence with it——Some grant, yea aſſert, ſome kind of ſupernatural operations of the Spirit to antecede, at leaſt accompany, the application of the token of the covenant to them; whereby, at leaſt, a *poſſe agere*, or ſome diſpoſitions facilitating their ſaving acting of grace are wrought. But others diſtinguiſh of the covenant: it is, ſay they, *internum, aut externum*, it is either *internal*, or *external*. By the *internal* covenant, they ſeem to mean the covenant as really and truly entered with the elect; enſuring to them grace and glory: by the *external* covenant they ſeem to mean, the covenant as viſibly appearing to be made with men, whether infants, or adult; when as it is not indeed really entered mutually between God and them—Again; Others, and ſometimes the ſame men, diſtinguiſh of the *good* contained in and conveyed by the promiſes of the covenant appertaining to the ſeed of believers. It is, ſay they, either *ſpiritual* and *ſaving*, or elſe only *external* and *eccleſiaſtical*; as memberſhip in a viſible church, a right to the outward ordinances and privileges of the church, and the like. And they conceive that the covenant, as containing ſaving ſpiritual mercies, only appertains to the *elect*; but, as containing external eccleſiaſtical privileges, it appertains to *all* the ſeed of believers: hence they call it, as entered with them, a covenant of *privileges*. This latter opinion, concerning the *definiteneſs* of the covenant, I take to be according to truth; though to diſtinguiſh either of the covenant, or the good contained in it, as entered with, or extended to infants, I ſee no ground, neither do I think it at all neceſſary. But I ſay, as to the nature of the covenant, I doubt not but that it is entered with, and extended to

to the infant ſeed of believers *definitely*; and, anſwerably, that the promiſes appertaining to them, are to be interpreted and underſtood in a definite notion, as appertaining equally and alike to each one in particular. I ſpeak of the covenant and promiſes, as entered with and made to the ſeed of believers, merely as ſuch——They [the infant ſeed of believers] are put into a *new covenant ſtate:* they are abſolutely, for the preſent, removed from under the covenant of works——They have, at preſent, *true*, *real*, and *proper intereſt and propriety in God*. As they are *his*, ſo he is *theirs*. There is a *mutual* propriety and intereſt in each other. They have God *under an* ACTUAL OBLIGATION, viz, of his promiſe, TO IMPROVE AND EMPLOY ALL HIS ATTRIBUTES FOR THEIR GOOD, BENEFIT, AND ADVANTAGE, according, or in a way agreeable to the true tenour of the covenant and of the various promiſes of it. They have a preſent intereſt in and right to ſalvation; and, anſwerably, in caſe of their death before a forfeiture be made of that their intereſt and right, they ſhall be infallibly ſaved*."—To ſuch a degree do they differ among themſelves, and oppoſe one another, as repreſented by Mr. WHISTON himſelf, in regard to what they conſider as a *principal* ground of Infant baptiſm! But we proceed.

Mr. JOHN TOMBES, having collected and compared the different views of Pædobaptiſts, relative to this matter, ſays; "Mr. BAXTER's *Plain Scripture*, &c. p. 223. will have baptiſm ſeal *only the conditional promiſe*. Mr. PHILIP's *Vind.* p. 37. expreſſeth the ſealing, *by offering*. Mr. DAVENPORT's *Confeſſion of faith*, p. 39. maketh the benefits

* *Primitive Doc. of Inf. Bap. revived*, p. 100—103, 151, 152.

nefits of the covenant to be *offered* in the ſacraments, but *to be exhibited only to true believers.* Mr. COTTON's *Grounds of Bap.* p. 70. The covenant of grace doth not *give* them ſaving grace at all, but only *offereth* it, and ſeals what it offereth. Dr. HOMES, that the *adminiſtration* of the covenant of grace, belongs to believers children, though not the *efficacy.* Dr. TWISSE, that infants are in the covenant of grace in the *judgment of charity*, and that baptiſm ſeals regeneration, &c. not *conferred*, but *to be* conferred. Dr. THOMAS GOODWIN, that they are to be judged in the covenant of grace *by parcels*, though not *in the lump* *." ——Bp. PRIDEAUX aſſerts, that infants "have the *faith of the covenant*, though not the *faith of covenantees* †." Mr. DORRINGTON inſiſts upon it, that "although the parents be admitted into the new covenant, the children born of them, are *not born within that covenant*; but are, as all others, born in a ſtate of rebellion and miſery ‡." With whom, in her Catechiſm, the Church of England ſeems to agree.

As the moſt learned and ſenſible Pædobaptiſts differ very widely from one another, in reference to this affair; ſo it is not uncommon for the ſame author to be manifeſtly *inconſiſtent with himſelf.* Of this, if I miſtake not, we have a remarkable inſtance in Mr. MATTHEW HENRY's *Treatiſe on Baptiſm*, lately publiſhed. In one place he ſays, "The goſpel contains not only a doctrine, but a covenant; and *by baptiſm* we are BROUGHT INTO that covenant §." In other places he inſiſts upon it, that "baptiſm is a ſeal of the covenant of grace, and therefore belongs to thoſe who ARE in that covenant (at leaſt by profeſſion)

* *Review*, Part III. p. 226.
† *Faſcicul. Controverſ.* p. 290.
‡ *Vindicat. of the Church in Baptizing Inf.* p. 44.
§ Page 40.

feſſion) and to NONE OTHER—The infants of believing parents ARE in covenant with God, and *therefore* have a right to the initiating ſeal of that covenant. When I ſay they are in covenant with God, underſtand me of the *external* adminiſtration of the covenant of grace, not of that which is *internal**."—The conduct of Mr. HENRY is quite ſimilar, in regard to *church memberſhip*. For, in one place, he tells us, that "baptiſm is an ordinance of Chriſt, *whereby* the perſon baptized is *ſolemnly* ADMITTED a member of the viſible church:" yet, in the ſame Treatiſe, he aſſures us, that baptiſm "is an ordinance of the viſible church, and pertains therefore to thoſe that ARE *viſible members* of the church—Their covenant right and their *church memberſhip*, intitleth them to baptiſm—Baptiſm doth not *give* the title, but *recognize* it, and complete that church memberſhip which before was imperfect†."—He acts the ſame part over again, in reſpect of *diſcipleſhip*, as the Reader may plainly perceive by comparing the two following arguments. "If it be the will and command of the Lord Jeſus that all nations ſhould be *diſcipled* BY BAPTISM; and children, though a part of all nations, are not excepted; then children are to be *diſcipled* BY BAPTISM—If the infants of believing parents ARE *diſciples*, they are to be baptized; but they ARE *diſciples*, and *therefore* to be baptized‡."—How happily do theſe expreſſions, *baptiſm* and *the covenant*; *baptiſm* and *diſciples*; *baptiſm* and *members of the viſible church*, play into the hands of each other! They are of ſo pliable a temper, of ſuch admirable force, and of ſuch various application, that, by a prudent management of them, the *ſame concluſion* may be inferred from *contrary premiſes*. Are you deſirous of proving,

* Page 66. 79. † P. 25. 66. 107. ‡ P. 114. 109.

proving, for inſtance, that the infants of believers are *not* in the covenant, are *not* diſciples, are *not* members of the viſible church; and that, therefore, they ought to be *baptized*, in order to an intereſt in thoſe prerogatives and honours? Or, are you inclined to load the Baptiſts with the opprobrious charge, of leaving their infants to the *uncovenanted mercies* of God, and in the *ſtate of Heathens?* Do but arrange the forementioned words in a certain manner, and you demonſtrate each particular. If, on the contrary, you reverſe that order, they will equally prove, with ſurpriſing facility and force, that thoſe very infants *are* in the covenant, that they *are* diſciples, that they *are* members of the viſible church; and, therefore ſhould be *baptized.* So that you ſee, though the *mediums* of your arguments be really oppoſite, yet the *concluſion* is quite the ſame, and juſt ſuch as you deſire. That is, the infants of believers ſhould be baptized, becauſe they are *not* in the covenant, and becauſe they *are* in the covenant. Thus the worthy Author inadvertently realizes that ſarcaſtic reflection of a profane poet;

> "And, as he is diſpos'd, can prove it,
> *Below* the moon, or elſe *above* it."

Now, as Mr. HENRY was an author of ſolid learning and of great parts; as the Treatiſe, in which theſe and other things of the ſame nature are found, appears to have been compoſed by him when age, obſervation, and ſtudy had matured his judgment; and as there is reaſon to think that the Editor, who greatly abridged the work, ſelected his beſt arguments in vindication of the point in hand; I leave the Reader to judge, whether we may not ſafely conclude, that a *conſiſtent* and *plauſible* defence of Infant baptiſm is no eaſy taſk.

REFLECT.

REFLECT. II. As the ſentiments of Pædobaptiſts about that intereſt in the covenant, which the children of believers are ſuppoſed to have, are greatly diverſified and at an irreconcilable variance one with another; ſo it appears, that this intereſt is either of *ſuch great* importance as to *ſecure* their eternal ſalvation, unleſs we renounce the doctrine of perſeverance; or, of ſo *trifling* a nature, as to leave them (the ſingle article of baptiſm excepted) on a *level* with the offspring of unbelievers, who enjoy the means of religious improvement. According to Mr. JOSEPH WHISTON, God muſt *cancel* the obligation under which he lies to promote their happineſs, if they be not finally ſaved: but where, then, is the *immutability* of Jehovah's covenant? Where, the *perſeverance* of thoſe who are truly intereſted in it, on ſuppoſition that any of them periſh for ever? To talk of them *forfeiting* their ſhare in that divine covenant, when they grow up, is plainly to renounce the doctrince of perſeverance.—On the other hand; If, with Dr. HOMES, and others, we conſider the offspring of believers as intereſted, not in the *efficacy*, but in the *adminiſtration*, of the covenant; or if, with Dr. TWISSE, we view them as in the covenant only by *a judgment of charity*; where is that mighty difference, between the ſtate and prerogatives of ſuch infants, and thoſe of children in common, who are brought up where the means of religious inſtruction are enjoyed? For what *is* the external adminiſtration of the covenant, but the benign conduct of Providence, in affording a written revelation, a goſpel miniſtry, and other means of ſpiritual information? all which are frequently poſſeſſed by the children of unbelievers, and by the unbelieving parents themſelves, to a great degree. Conſequently, if a claim to baptiſm be the natural reſult of an intereſt in the external

ternal adminiſtration of the covenant, *all*, whether children, or adults, who are indulged by a kind Providence with means adapted to their ſpiritual welfare, ſhould be baptized. And, as to *a judgment of charity*, will our Brethren affirm, that the children of believers are the *only* infantile objects on whom it ſhould operate? Is that favourable eſtimation to be *witheld, intirely* witheld, from all the children of ungodly parents? Do not Scripture and obſervation ſhew, that many of theſe were included, from their earlieſt infancy, in the everlaſting covenant? Or, will they affirm, that *all* the infants of *all* believers are intereſted in God's peculiar favour? They will not, they dare not aſſert any ſuch thing; becauſe the Oracles of Heaven and the obſervation of ages forbid the thought. It ſeems, therefore, as if that intereſt in the covenant for which they ſo earneſtly plead, were calculated merely to provide for the *baptiſm* of a particular deſcription of infants; which, indeed, would make an eſſential difference between the children of believers, and thoſe of ungodly parents, were the benefits connected with baptiſm by the Council of Trent, by many of the Lutherans, by our Engliſh Eſtabliſhment, by Mr. MATT. HENRY, and a thouſand others, but fairly proved from the divine Records.

REFLECT. III. But ſuppoſing it were clearly evinced, that all the children of believers are intereſted in the covenant of grace; it would not certainly follow, that they are intitled to baptiſm. For, baptiſm, being a branch of *poſitive* worſhip, depends intirely on the ſovereign will of its Author; which will, revealed in poſitive precepts, or by apoſtolic examples, is the only rule of its adminiſtration. All reaſoning, therefore, from *data* of a moral kind and the ſuppoſed fitneſs of things, or from the natural relation

tion of children to parents, is wide of the mark. As baptiſm is not a duty *naturally* reſulting from our relation to God, as reaſonable creatures; for then it would be incumbent on *every man* to be baptized: as our obligation to regard it does not ariſe from any moral, or civil relation, in which we neceſſarily ſtand to our fellow creatures; for then the ſame conſequence would inevitably follow: and as this duty does not originate in the natural relation between parents and children; for then *all* parents, *whoever they be*, would lie under an obligation to have their infants baptized: ſo it is altogether vain to ſearch any where for the proper ſubjects of baptiſm, except in the appointment of Chriſt and apoſtolic practice; theſe being the only rule and law of its adminiſtration. See CHAPTER I. Now it appears from CHAPTER VIII. that the Scripture contains neither precept nor precedent for Infant baptiſm; and, conſequently, it is practiſed without a divine warrant.

Beſides, were it allowable to reaſon from *covenant intereſt*, to the enjoyment of a *poſitive rite*, Abraham and his poſterity might, with other nations in following times *, have circumciſed their females, in ſome way or other. On that principle, they might have argued thus: "Circumciſion is a ſign of the covenant, into which God has graciouſly entered on our behalf. That covenant extends its benign influence

* Of this many learned authors have ſpoken. In confirmation of the fact, however, I ſhall only tranſcribe a quotation from AMBROSIUS, as it ſtands in WITSIUS. "Ægyptii quarto decimo anno circumcidunt mares. *Fœminæ* apud eos eodem anno circumciduntur. Quod eó ſcil. anno incipiet flagrare paſſio virilis et fœminarum menſtrua ſumant exordia," *Judæus Chriſtianizans*, Prolegom. p. 14. Ultraject. 1661.

influence equally to both ſexes: nor can it be imagined, with reaſon, that the ſign of this federal conſtitution ſhould be intirely witheld from any of the covenantees. But our females are ſuch; and, conſequently, intitled to circumciſion, or ſomething ſimilar. Nor is it of any avail to object, that they are not *expreſſly* mentioned in the order given for the adminiſtration of that appointment. God has made us reaſonable creatures; and he requires that we ſhould uſe our intellectual powers; on the nature, the application, and the deſign of all his inſtitutions. Now, as nothing is more clear, than that the covenant, of which circumciſion is a ſeal, comprehends our *female* children; and as nothing is more weak, than to imagine, that any ſhould be intereſted in the *benefits* of this divine conſtitution, and yet be utterly forbidden the *ſign* of that intereſt; the want of an expreſs direction in this caſe, is a trifling objection and worthy of no regard."—Perfectly agreeable to this way of reaſoning, is the language of Mr. HENRY, when he ſays; "Conſequences from Scripture, are good proofs, [in reference to *poſitive* inſtiſtitutions.] The Scriptures were written for *rational* creatures. And is not ſcripture reaſoning the ſenſe and meaning of Scripture? If the *premiſes* be plain ſcripture truths, and granted, they are unworthy to be diſputed with, who deny the concluſion *."—Hence it appears, that a little reaſoning on the covenant made with Abraham, and a few deductions from the nature and fitneſs of things, would have inferred the right of Jewiſh females to circumciſion, in a manner ſimilar to that by which our Brethren endeavour to authenticate the baptiſm of infants.

Further: As our opponents in general agree, to denominate

* *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 78.

denominate baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper *ſeals* of the covenant; ſo, while they infer the title of infants to baptiſm, from their intereſt in that covenant, conſiſtency requires that *both* thoſe ſuppoſed ſeals ſhould be applied to them. It certainly wears a very awkward appearance, to inſiſt on their being intereſted in a covenant that has *two* ſeals for its ratification, and yet maintain that they have no right at all to *one* of thoſe ſeals. What, ſhall perſons be really and lawfully intereſted in a covenant that is big with bleſſings to the covenantees, and yet be intitled to a *bare moiety* of thoſe very ſeals which confirm it, and are the ſigns of intereſt in it! This, apparently, ſavours of the paradox.—Nor is this appearance of inconſiſtency leſſened, but rather increaſed, by conſidering the infants of believers as intereſted only in the *external adminiſtration* of the covenant. For, baptiſm and the holy ſupper being equally *external* rites, equally external *ſeals* of the covenant, and equally parts of its external *adminiſtration*; it ſeems yet more paradoxical for any to maintain, that the title of infants to *one* of thoſe ſeals is perfectly valid, while they have neither part nor lot in the other.—The reaſoning of our oppoſers, on this branch of the ſubject, is very remarkable. Firſt they labour to prove, that the infants of godly perſons are *in the covenant of grace*, together with their parents. An exalted privilege this, it muſt be allowed. Many of them, notwithſtanding, when they explain their meaning, freely declare, it is only the *external* adminiſtration of that covenant which they intend. This very much ſinks the former idea. For *that* is like proclaiming thoſe infants heirs of the kingdom, and aſcertaining their enjoyment of it: while *this* barely exhibits the glorious object, but

leaves it quite uncertain whether they ſhall ever have a heart ſo much as to ſeek it. The *former* is like the ſun, in his meridian blaze; the *latter* like a glow worm, juſt viſible at midnight. *One* ſecures their final ſalvation; the *other* may be an innocent occaſion of their aggravated ruin.—Our Brethren tell us, however, that this external adminiſtration has *two ſeals* annexed to it by our ſovereign Lord. Surely, then, as the grand privilege of being *in the covenant*, is already reduced to an intereſt in the *external adminiſtration* of it, this adminiſtration itſelf will be left intire for the uſe of theſe diſtinguiſhed infants. But even *this* cannot be granted. For though theſe two ſuppoſed ſeals moſt certainly belong to that external adminiſtration, of which they ſpeak; yet the highly favoured infants muſt not, at any rate, have more than *one* of them. So that, after all, their prerogative, above the children of Heathens, amounts only to this; They are intereſted in an *external* adminiſtration of the covenant—an adminiſtration too, that is but *half* confirmed, as having but one of its two ſeals appended to it. They may, indeed, if they die in their infancy, be completely ſaved; yet not in virtue of the forementioned intereſt, for that aſcertains no ſpiritual bleſſing; but by divine grace, through the redemption which is in Jeſus Chriſt: and ſo may the dying infants of Heathens. They may alſo, when grown to years of underſtanding, have the covenant *internally* adminiſtered to them, by the Divine Spirit producing repentance, and faith, and holy obedience, in their hearts and lives: but neither is this peculiar to them; for the whole world ſhould be ſaved, if all the world *believed*, *really* believed, in Jeſus Chriſt.

REFLECT. IV. It is worthy of conſideration, whether this doctrine concerning the federal intereſt of

of infants, be not calculated to harden their conſciences in an unconverted ſtate, and to fluſh them with falſe hopes, when grown to years of reflection. This tendency it apparently has, whether that intereſt be conſidered as their *title* to baptiſm; or their baptiſm, as the *mean* of that intereſt: for, in both caſes, the piety of *their parents* is the grand principle on which the reaſoning proceeds. We will ſuppoſe a number of children growing up in life, whoſe parents are pious perſons; we will further ſuppoſe Mr. JOSEPH WHISTON to addreſs them in the words before quoted, only uſing the *ſecond* perſon plural, inſtead of the *third*. "Ye, my dear young friends, he will ſay, and I rejoice in the thought, YE are put into *a new covenant ſtate*: YE are abſolutely, for the preſent, removed from under the covenant of works——YE have, at preſent, *true*, *real*, and *proper* intereſt and propriety in God. As ye are *his*, ſo he is YOURS. There is a mutual propriety and intereſt in each other. YE have God UNDER AN ACTUAL OBLIGATION, viz. of his promiſe, *to improve and employ* ALL HIS ATTRIBUTES *for your good, benefit, and advantage*, according, or in a way agreeable, to the true tenour of the covenant and of the various promiſes of it. YOU have a *preſent* intereſt in and right to ſalvation; and, anſwerably, in caſe of your death, before a forfeiture be made of that intereſt and right, you ſhall be *infallibly ſaved*." See REFLECT. I. —We will ſuppoſe the ſame circle of young perſons addreſſed by their parents, on the principles inculcated, and according to the plan of prayer ſuggeſted, by Mr. MATT. HENRY, when ſpeaking to ſuch parents. That well known author ſays; "Look upon their baptiſm, and you will ſee upon what grounds

grounds you go in praying for them. You pray for them, as IN COVENANT WITH GOD, INTERESTED IN THE PROMISES, SEALED TO BE THE LORD'S: and thoſe are good pleas in prayer, to be uſed for the confirmation of your faith. Pray that God would treat them *as his*; *tell him*, and *humbly* INSIST *upon it*, *that they* ARE HIS; whom you gave to him, and of whom *he accepted:* and will he not take care of HIS OWN*?"

Now if this be the language of reverence, of devotion, and of propriety, when parents are addreſſing God on the behalf of their children; it cannot be improper for the ſame parents often and earneſtly to urge on the minds and to fix in the memories of their growing offspring a conviction of, their *intereſt* in the covenant, their *claim* on the promiſes, and their being *ſealed*, as Jehovah's peculiar property. Nor can it be doubted, if this conduct be right, but the *prayers* of the children, when they grow up, ſhould be an *echo* to thoſe of their parents for them. Yes, on the principles of Meſſrs. WHISTON and HENRY, they may boldly ſay; "Lord, *we* are in covenant with thee, *we* are intereſted in thy promiſes, *we* are ſealed to be thine; we pray thee, therefore, to treat US *as thy own*. We further make free to *tell* thee, and humbly INSIST upon it, that we ARE THINE; for we were *given* to thee and *accepted* by thee: and wilt thou not take care of *thy own?* Divine fidelity forbids the painful thought, of our ever being abandoned by thee." Thus the children of religious parents are taught, as ſoon as they can pray at all, to lift up their heads in the preſence of God, and to copy, with a confident front, an ancient example of prayer that Luke has recorded—

an

* *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 241, 242.

an example which, though imitated by many, is avowed by few. For the purport of their language is; "We thank thee, O God, that WE are not as the children of *other men*, who are not intereſted in thy *covenant*, have no ſhare in thy *promiſes*, nor any right in thy confirming *ſeal*. We contemplate with peculiar pleaſure, the *vaſt difference* there is between *us*, and the offſpring of our profligate neighbour, *Publicanus*."—Now as theſe are the genuine conſequences of Mr. HENRY's dictates on the ſubject before us, I may venture an appeal to the impartial Reader; Whether ſuch ſentiments, imbibed by the children of godly parents, be not adapted to *harden* their conſciences in an unregenerate ſtate, and to render them eaſy under a vain ſuppoſition of their being the favourites of Heaven from their earlieſt infancy? For if, as Dr. OWEN well obſerves, "the father of lies himſelf could hardly have invented a more *pernicious* opinion," than that which connects *regeneration* with *baptiſm*; *this*, which unites the grand idea of *intereſt in the covenant*, *the promiſes*, and *the ſacred ſeal*, with *a deſcent* from believing parents, cannot be innocent.—Were Mr. HENRY now living, ſome faithful friend, perhaps, might whiſper in his ear the following admonition. "Surely, Sir, you teach religious parents to treat the GREAT SUPREME in a very FAMILIAR manner! as if you had been *witneſs* to a written agreement between Him and them, and of their having received an earneſt from Him, of what he engaged under his own hand and ſeal, to do for their children. Beſides, you ſeem to have intirely forgotten a ſalutary caution, which, on another occaſion, you have given to the ſeed of believers. Among your many excellent practical Notes on the Scripture, this, I remember, is one. *It doth not follow,*

follow, that becauſe they are the ſeed of Abraham, *therefore they muſt needs be* the children of God—*though it is* common *for people thus to ſtretch the meaning of God's promiſe, to bolſter themſelves up in a vain hope**. Pardon me, Sir, if I take the freedom to intimate, that, upon reading your directions to believing parents, in regard to the *grounds* of devotional addreſſes for their baptized infants; the prayer which PELAGIUS is reported to have taught a widow came freſh to remembrance. That ancient Briton, as you, perhaps, may recollect, adviſed his female diſciple thus to addreſs the Omniſcient. *Thou knoweſt, O Lord, how holy, and pure, and clean, from all wickedneſs, and iniquity, and rapine, theſe hands are, which I now lift up to thee: like as the lips, with which I offer ſupplications to thee, to have mercy upon me, are pure, and clean, and free from all falſhood*†. Forgive my ſuſpicions, dear Sir, if I cannot but apprehend, that there is too great a likeneſs between the *grounds* of your parental prayers, and thoſe of this widow, as taught by PELAGIUS. The reaſons of expecting an anſwer, in both caſes, are, not *ſovereign mercy* and *atoning* blood; theſe lie open to a *Publican*, when praying for himſelf, or his offſpring—theſe lie open to the *vileſt wretch* upon earth, has he but a heart to pray; but a ſuppoſed and *immenſe difference* between the *ſtate* and *character*, of certain infants, in one caſe; of a widow, in the other; compared with thoſe of children and of adults *in common*."

* *Expoſ.* on Rom. ix. 6, 7. † In Dr. OWEN, *on the Holy Spirit*, B. III. Chap. V. p. 266.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Jewiſh Circumciſion.

DR. WILLET: "Arguments drawn from types and figures conclude not, unleſs they be types ordained of God to ſuch uſe; neither are the ſacraments of the goſpel to be ſquared out according to the pattern of the ceremonies of the law. We alſo deny that the ceremonies and rites of the law, as the paſchal lamb, manna, and the reſt, are figures and types of our ſacraments; but both their ſacraments and ours are figures and repreſentations of Chriſt." *Synopſ. Papiſmi*, p. 643.

2. Dr. HAMMOND: "By all this [acount of the Jewiſh proſelyte baptiſm] it appears, how little needful it will be, to defend the baptiſm of Chriſtian infants, from the law of circumciſing infants among the Jews; the foundation being *far more fitly* laid in that other of Jewiſh baptiſm, a ceremony of initiation for all, eſpecially for proſelytes, as well as that; and whereas that of circumciſion belonged only to one, this other being common to both ſexes—Baptiſm is no more ſpiritual circumciſion, than circumciſion is ſpiritual baptiſm." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 474. 483. Edit. 1674.

3. TURRETTINUS: "Circumciſion repreſented, not *baptiſm*, but the grace of regeneration; which, likewiſe, is ſealed by baptiſm. The paſchal lamb repreſented, not the ſacred ſupper, but Chriſt himſelf, exhibited in the ſupper. And the baptiſm of the ancient Iſraelites, in the cloud and in the ſea, was a ſacrament, not of our baptiſm, but of the thing ſignified by it; like as the rock and the water flowing from it, ſignified, not the holy ſupper, but Chriſt himſelf, as Paul explains it, 1 Cor. x. 3, 4." *Diſput. de Bap. Nubis et Maris*, § 17.

4. Dr.

4. Dr. CLARKE: "By analogy drawn from the rite of *circumciſion*, it has, for very many ages, been the general practice in the Chriſtian church to receive infants by baptiſm into the obligations of faith and obedience to the goſpel; and to make profeſſion for them, which they are to believe and obey. Whether this analogy be *rightly drawn*, or no, and be a *ſufficient* and *adequate* foundation for what has been built upon it, is *a controverſy*." Vol. I. Serm. XXXVIII. p. 241. Fol. Edit.

5. Lord BROOKE: "To thoſe that hold we may go no farther than Scripture, for doctrine or diſcipline, it may be very eaſy to err in this point now in hand [i. e. Infant baptiſm;] ſince the Scripture ſeems not to have clearly determined this particular. The analogy which baptiſm now hath with circumciſion in the old law, is a fine rhetorical argument, to illuſtrate a point *well proved before*; but I ſomewhat doubt whether it be proof enough for that which ſome would prove by it: ſince, beſides the *vaſt difference* in the ordinances, the perſons to be circumciſed are ſtated by a *poſitive law*, ſo expreſs that it leaves no place for ſcruple. But it is *far otherwiſe* in baptiſm; where all the deſignation of perſons fit to be partakers, for aught I know, is only, SUCH AS BELIEVE. For this is the qualification that, with exacteſt ſearch, I find the Scripture requires in perſons to be baptized; and *this* it ſeems to require in *all* ſuch perſons. Now, how infants can be properly ſaid to *believe*, I am not yet fully reſolved." *Diſcourſe of Epiſcopacy*, Sect. II. Chap. VII. p. 97.

6. Mr. BALL: "In whatſoever they [circumciſion and baptiſm] agree, or differ, we muſt look to *the inſtitution*, and neither ſtretch it wider, nor draw it narrower, than the Lord hath made it. For he

he is the inſtitutor of the ſacraments according to his own good pleaſure; and it is our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what end the ſacraments are to be adminiſtered; how they agree, and wherein they differ. In all which we muſt affirm nothing, but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught us." In Mr. TOMBES's *Examen of* Mr. MARSHALL's *Serm.* p. 2, 3.

7. Dr. PRIESTLEY: "It was natural for the Apoſtles, and other Jews, on the inſtitution of baptiſm, to apply it to infants, as well as to adults, as a token of the profeſſion of Chriſtianity by the maſter of the family only; and this they would do without conſidering it as a *ſubſtitute* for circumciſion, and *ſucceeding in the place of it*, which it is never ſaid to do in the Scriptures, though ſome have been led by ſome circumſtances of reſemblance in the two rites, to imagine that this was the caſe." *Hiſt. of Corrup. of Chriſt.* Vol. II. p. 71.

8. LIMBORCH: "*Baptiſm* [it is aſſerted] came in the room of *circumciſion*; and ſince the *latter* was adminiſtered to infants, the *former* ought to be adminiſtered to them likewiſe. *Anſw.* Taking this for granted, yet it will by no means follow, that all the circumſtances preſcribed in circumciſion ſhould likewiſe be obſerved in baptiſm. For, firſt, Infant baptiſm is no where ſo expreſſly commanded as circumciſion is. Secondly, it would from thence follow, that infants ſhould be baptized on the *eighth* day preciſely, or elſe they would be cut off from the people of God. Thirdly, nay, they ſhould be baptized as ſoon as they are *born*; for ſince there is no day preſixed for Infant baptiſm, and it may be adminiſtered to infants immediately upon their birth, without any prejudice, and children may die as ſoon as they are born; no reaſon can be aſſigned why it ſhould be

put off even for one day. Fourthly, and laſtly; If this conſequence were of any force, I might with parity of reaſon infer, that ſince the *males* were only [*males* only were] circumciſed, therefore now it is unlawful for the *females* to be baptized; which (as any one may perceive) being very abſurd, 'tis plain that with reſpect to the outward circumſtances, the caſe of circumciſion and baptiſm is not in all things the ſame." *Compleat Syſt. Div.* Book V. Chap. XXII. Sect. II.

9. Dr. ERSKINE: "That it [baptiſm] came in the place of circumciſion I allow, in ſo far as circumciſion was a ſeal to real ſaints of the righteouſneſs of faith; not in ſo far as it ſealed external privileges to all the Jews, and was a badge of diſtinction between them and other nations. Baptiſm has none of theſe properties, which rendered circumciſion a fit ſign and ſeal of an external covenant. Circumciſion impreſſed an *abiding mark*; was the *characteriſtic* of Judaiſm; belonged to *all* Jews, however differing in opinion or practice; and thoſe born of a Jew, even when come to age, were entitled to it. Whereas baptiſm impreſſes no abiding mark. A profeſſion and ſuitable practice, not baptiſm, is the characteriſtic of Chriſtianity. And perſons come to age, have no juſt title to baptiſm, till they believe and repent; and therefore are not baptized, unleſs their opinions and practices appear agreeable to the goſpel; their credible profeſſion, and not their deſcent, founding their outward claim to that privilege. The proof of this is extremely obvious. John's baptiſm was termed the baptiſm *of repentance*, and baptiſm *to repentance*; becauſe he required of *all*, whom he admitted to baptiſm, a profeſſion of repentance, and exhorted them to ſuch a conduct

a conduct as would demonſtrate their repentance genuine. Peter demanded repentance of his hearers, in order to baptiſm; and *only* they that gladly received his word were baptized. And Philip acquaints the Eunuch, if thou believe with thy whole heart, thou mayeſt be baptized. Well, therefore, does Paul join together, the *waſhing* of water, and the *renewing* of the Holy Ghoſt, as things which *ſhould never be ſeparated.* And, for the ſame reaſon, Peter informs us, that baptiſm is of no avail unleſs attended with *the anſwer of a good conſcience*, i. e. a ſincere and cordial acceptance of the offers of the goſpel. Acts xix. 4. Mat. iii. 6, 8, 11. Acts ii. 38, 41. and viii. 37. Tit. iii. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 21." *Theolog. Diſſertations*, p. 78, 79, 80.

10. Mr. JAMES OWEN: "No argument *can* be drawn from the ceremonial law, to the goſpel, becauſe we are not under the obligation of that law." *Hiſt. of Images and of Image Worſhip*, p. 107.

11. VENEMA: "What ſhall we ſay to *circumciſion?* Shall we deny that *baptiſm* ſucceeded in its place? I will not do it, becauſe it is a received hypotheſis; and, rightly underſtood, has nothing inconſiſtent with the truth. But what then? Muſt I therefore allow, or does it thence follow, that the *deſign* and the *end* of baptiſm and of circumciſion were the ſame? Certainly, by no means. For, according to the different nature of the OEconomies, there ought to be a different aſpect of the ſacraments, and a different end——Circumciſion, according to a twofold covenant, internal and external, which then exiſted, had likewiſe a twofold aſpect, *ſpiritual* and *carnal.* The *former* referred to the internal covenant of grace; the *latter* to a legal, typical, and external covenant. *That* was concerned in *ſealing the righteouſneſs of faith*, as the Apoſtle

Apoſtle aſſerts; *this* in the external prerogatives of Judaiſm, and in confirming external benefits. *That* was peculiar to the believing Iſraelites; *this* was common to the whole people. *This* might have equally ſubſiſted by itſelf, ſeparate from *that*; as the legal covenant have ſtood by itſelf, without the covenant of grace. This twofold and different aſpect of circumciſion being ſuppoſed and admitted, the whole queſtion will be; Whether baptiſm anſwer to *both*, or only to *one*, of thoſe different appearances? Whether it ſucceeded to circumciſion *abſolutely* and in *all reſpects*; or in a *reſtricted* ſenſe, and *to ſome* only? Which controverſy cannot be determined, but from a compariſon of both OEconomies, a contemplation on the nature of each ſacrament, and, indeed, the clear doctrine of Scripture. For, ſhould you urge the word *ſucceſſion*, as if that which ſucceeds another, muſt in all reſpects ſupply its place, you ſtumble in a twofold manner: both becauſe every like, has not neceſſarily a perfect likeneſs, as a thouſand examples teach. He is the ſucceſſor of one, who ſucceeds to *part* of his office. It is one thing to *ſucceed*; another to do it *perfectly*. And becauſe you urge a word that is not found in the Scripture; for the Scriptures no where affirm, *that baptiſm holds the place of circumciſion*. Nor from that place of Paul, Col. ii. 11, 12. can any thing elſe be inferred, than that the two ſacraments anſwer one another; for it is not there aſſerted in expreſs words. The Apoſtle ſimply aſſerts, in thoſe words, that baptiſm anſwers to *ſpiritual* circumciſion.

"The queſtion requires reaſons of a different kind, by which it may be determined. And ſeeing I perceive none produced for a *perfect* ſimilitude, it is my intention to eſtabliſh an *imperfect* likeneſs; that ſo it may clearly appear, that baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion,

ciſion, not according to an *external*, but only an *internal* and *myſtical* conſideration. Firſt; The genius of the New OEconomy affords the firſt and the cleareſt reaſon; ſeeing a ſacrament of it, cannot be foreign from its nature. Now *that* is ſpiritual, and abhorrent from an external covenant, as I have endeavoured to demonſtrate; wherefore it anſwers only to the ſpiritual part of the Old OEconomy. Whence it is evident, if I miſtake not, that a ſacrament of the New Covenant agrees to circumciſion, ſo far as it pertains to a ſpiritual and internal covenant: not according to its external uſe, by which it confirmed a literal covenant; for ſuch a covenant does not *now* exiſt. Secondly; Baptiſm cannot rightly agree to the external and literal deſign of circumciſion, unleſs at the ſame time it alſo agree in thoſe things that are connected with its external appearance; and they are theſe. It was a *permanent* ſign. It was a *characteriſtical mark* of Judaiſm. *Birth* itſelf gave a right to it, even in adults. It, therefore, belonged to the *whole* people, nor was it capable of being eraſed by any opinions or conduct, provided the foundations of Judaiſm were not ſubverted by them. Theſe things agreed to circumciſion, conſidered ſimply as an external ſign; *all* which are otherwiſe now, in regard to baptiſm. Baptiſm is *not* a permanent mark. It is *not* a diſtinguiſhing character of real Chriſtianity; for that conſiſts in a confeſſion of faith, and a life agreeable to it: by no means in *baptiſm*, to which ſuch an idea in no way agrees, except ſo far as it is an external confeſſion and ſignification of our unfeigned faith. Further: Not *birth* but a *confeſſion of faith*, transfers the ſacred immerſion to adults. They are dipped, not becauſe they were born of Chriſtian parents; but becauſe they profeſs faith.

Laſtly;

Laſtly: Not men of every opinion, ſect, and courſe of life, are immerſed in the ſacred font; but thoſe who evidence a ſound faith and a virtuous conduct. Which difference, in this reſpect ſufficiently remarkable, evinces a difference and a great diſſimilitude between the two ſacraments. I omit other circumſtances of diſagreement, becauſe they were marks of ſuch a kind, as were peculiar to circumciſion as an *external ſign*, and do not ſo properly come under conſideration here.

"I would have it particularly obſerved, that circumciſion, ſo far as it was an external ſign, ſealed to the Iſraelites their *carnal deſcent* from Abraham; and, therefore, their title to the poſſeſſion of *terreſtrial* benefits. For, ſeeing the promiſes were made to Abraham and his poſterity, God affixed a ſign of that kind *membro genitali*, that it might appear to all, by this mark alone, that they drew their origin from Abraham, and were the heirs of terreſtrial bleſſings; which is the *true* and *firſt deſign* of literal circumciſion. This alſo is the reaſon, why the promiſe of a long life in the land of Canaan, was annexed to the precept concerning the honour that is due to parents. Hence alſo the reaſon is to be ſought, for their wearing this mark *genitali membro*; namely, that a numerous offspring, and the benefits connected with their very nativity, might be ſtrongly repreſented. What, now, in this reſpect, has *baptiſm* in common with circumciſion? Nothing at all: whence the difference between baptiſm and circumciſion, as an external ſign, moſt plainly appears.

"Once more: Circumciſion, according to its external aſpect, was a *typical* ſacrament, by which future ſpiritual benefits were exhibited to view; ſo that the circumciſed Iſraelite himſelf, conſtituted a part of the *type*. But baptiſm is only a ſign of the covenant,

by

by which the bleſſings of a preſent covenant are preſented and ſealed to the covenantees; which things are very widely different. And then, baptiſm exhibits, in a pledge, thoſe very ſpiritual benefits, which circumciſion *typically* expreſſed. Baptiſm, then, ſucceeds in the place of circumciſion, according to its *myſtical* ſignification, ſealing the good things repreſented by it. It is not, therefore, an external ſign, like circumciſion; but a myſtical one, agreeable to its myſtical end. Beſides, if baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion, as a type; then a *type* came in the *place* of a type, which is moſt abſurd.

"I will briefly explain what is to be inferred from Col. ii. 11, 12. concerning the ſucceſſion of baptiſm, in the place of circumciſion. No direct mention is there made of *ſucceſſion*; for two things may agree, in a certain reſpect, without the one ſupplying the place of the other, and, for that reaſon, appointed to do it. The *deluge* and *baptiſm*, ſo anſwer one another in ſpiritual ſignification, that Peter calls *this* the ANTITYPE of *that*; yet it never came into the mind of any one hence to infer, that *baptiſm* came in the place of the *deluge*. But ſeeing circumciſion was an ordinary ſacrament of the Old, as baptiſm is of the New Teſtament, and they excellently anſwer one another in their ſpiritual deſign; hence I admit, that the one may be ſaid to occupy the place of the other. Circumciſion, as a type of *ſpiritual circumciſion*, having obtained its fulfilment under the New OEconomy; the former muſt give place to the latter, as the ſhadow to the body. And as there is a ſign and ſeal of the ſame bleſſing in baptiſm; hence it ſucceeds circumciſion, in regard to *ſpiritual ſignification:* not as a *type*, an external and carnal ſign, to a *type*; but as a *pledge*, of what is repreſented and preſent, to a

type

type of the ſame thing, as future and to be performed. The type being vaniſhed away, the ſeal is appointed: the ſame ſpiritual object was the end of both, but they did not lead to it in the ſame way. The idea of *ſucceſſion*, therefore, is to be admitted, not in reſpect of the *manner*, but of the *ſpiritual object*; as is manifeſt from what has been ſaid. But, further, circumciſion was a ſeal of righteouſneſs and ſanctification, which were then diſpenſed to the fathers by anticipation: in which ſenſe it is far more accurately ſaid, that *baptiſm* came in its place, as each of them is a ſeal of the ſame thing. Seeing, then, that the *whole agreement* between circumciſion and baptiſm, and the *ſucceſſion* of one to the other, muſt be ſought in their *ſpiritual object*, in whatever way you underſtand it; *to ſettle the external aſpect and end of baptiſm, a compariſon of it with circumciſion avails nothing at all.*" *Diſſertat. Sacræ*, L. II. C. XV. § 6, 7, 8, 9. 11.—See alſo SECT. II. No. 2. of this CHAP.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It appears by theſe quotations from learned Pædobaptiſts, That there are *various* and *great diſparities* between baptiſm and circumciſion. See No. 8, 9. 11.—That, ſuppoſing the analogy between them were ever ſo great, it would ſtill be our duty to regard the *inſtitution* of baptiſm and take it as it is; becauſe that analogy could not be produced by way of *proof*, but only as an *illuſtration* of what is already proved by other mediums. See No. 5, 6.—That circumciſion did *not repreſent* baptiſm; nor does the Scripture any where teach us, that the latter *ſucceeded* to the place of the former. See No. 3. 7. 11.—That, admitting baptiſm to have come in the place

place of circumciſion, it would not follow that the deſign of each was the ſame. See No. 11.—That we muſt not *accommodate* the poſitive appointments of the New, to thoſe of the Old Teſtament, the two diſpenſations being ſo very different. See No. 1. 10, 11.—And, that the Jewiſh proſelyte baptiſm, already conſidered, is a *much better foundation* for Pædobaptiſm, than circumciſion. See No. 2. Such is the teſtimony which theſe reſpectable authors bear. Nor are the paſſages produced to be conſidered in the light of *mere authorities*; for moſt of theſe writers, and eſpecially the learned, judicious, and impartial VENEMA, ſupport their opinion by *argument:* which, whether it be concluſive, and whether in our favour, the Reader will judge.

REFLECT. II. That the title of infants to baptiſm, cannot be juſtly inferred from the obſolete rite of circumciſion, will further appear, if the following things be duly conſidered. Baptiſm is an appointment *purely* religious, and intended for purpoſes *intirely* ſpiritual: but circumciſion, beſides the ſpiritual inſtruction ſuggeſted by it, was a ſign of *carnal deſcent*, a mark of *national diſtinction*, and a token of intereſt in thoſe *temporal* bleſſings that were promiſed to Abraham *. This *political* aſpect of that ancient ceremony ſeems to have been the reaſon, why its performance on the *ſabbath* could not be juſtified, except by the law of inſtitution requiring its adminiſtration

* Dr. ERSKINE ſays; "When God promiſed the land of Canaan to Abraham and his ſeed, circumciſion was inſtituted for this among other purpoſes, to ſhew that *deſcent* from Abraham was the foundation of his poſterity's right to thoſe bleſſings." *Theolog. Diſſert.* p. 9. See alſo, M. PASCAL's *Thoughts on Relig.* Chap. XVIII. and Mr. CHAMBERS's *Cyclopædia*, Article, CIRCUMCISION.

ſtration preciſely on the *eighth* day, Joh. vii. 22, 23. and ſo it was the opinion of the Rabbies, that circumciſion *drove away* the ſabbath. See GROTIUS and Dr. GILL, on Joh. vii. 22, 23. But baptiſm, being a branch of divine worſhip, to be performed with the utmoſt ſolemnity, and for purpoſes merely religious; the adminiſtration of it is perfectly ſuitable to God's holy day. Is it natural, then, is it logical, for any to infer, that becauſe *male* infants were circumciſed, partly with *political* views, and by the *expreſs* order of Jehovah; that both male and *female* infants ought now to be baptized, for ends *intirely ſpiritual*, and *without* an expreſs command?

Again: The Iſraelites were a *national* church. To be an obedient ſubject of their civil government, and a complete member in their church ſtate, were the ſame thing: becauſe, by treating Jehovah as their political ſovereign, they avowed him as the true God. Agreeably to which, under that OEconomy, Jehovah acknowledged all thoſe for *his people*, and himſelf as *their God*, who performed an external obedience to his commands; even though, in their hearts, diſaffected to him. To this *eccleſiaſtico-political* conſtitution, circumciſion was adapted. In purſuance of which, not only male infants, but *adults*, if deſcended from Abraham and not circumciſed when young, were intitled to the diſtinguiſhing mark, merely in virtue of their carnal deſcent. This right they enjoyed independent of ſanctifying grace, either in themſelves or their parents; and even detached from every idea of a pretenſion to it, in the one or the other. Nay, the domeſtics of Abraham, whether born in his houſe, or bought with his money; whether in a carnal, or a regenerate ſtate; were as fully intitled to this rite as their venerable maſter. In proof of theſe things,

things, we need no other evidence than the inſtitution itſelf, as recorded in Gen. xvii. 9—14.—But, in regard to baptiſm, and the connections in which it ſtands, all things are otherwiſe. The Hebrew Theocracy has long ceaſed to exiſt. Their national church is utterly diſſolved. The charter alſo, by which the choſen tribes were incorporated, has intirely ſpent its force, and is become for ever obſolete.—It muſt, indeed, be allowed, that ever ſince CONSTANTINE aſcended the throne of the empire, national churches have greatly prevailed; as being perfectly well ſuited to a kind of *political* Chriſtianity which then came into faſhion, and is yet in great repute. Nor are thoſe conſtitutions likely to fail, while the policy of ſovereign princes and the pride of aſpiring prelates can ſupport them: but, not having a divine charter, and being eſtabliſhed by human laws, they are merely *ſecular* kingdoms; notwithſtanding the *real* piety of many that belong to thoſe eſtabliſhments. Being ſuch, it is neceſſary that each of them ſhould have a viſible head, either civil or eccleſiaſtical, either prince or pontiff; whoſe creed ſhall be the ſtandard of ſacred truth to all the ſubjects of his dominions. It is neceſſary alſo, that each of theſe eccleſiaſtical principalities ſhould have a code of laws for its government, very different, in many reſpects, from the ſacred canons of the New Teſtament: for the divine Author of that ancient book, having no idea of Chriſtian communities formed on this plan, has not provided for their various exigencies. Now, to the continuance and ſupport of theſe eccleſiaſtical corporations, Infant baptiſm is well adapted: whereas, it is plain, that if the church of Chriſt be *congregational*, conſiſting only of ſuch perſons as are called by the goſpel and make a credible profeſſion of repentance

pentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; it neither *needs* nor *admits* of ſuch a ſupport. For the great Proprietor and Lord of the Chriſtian church, having abſolutely diſclaimed a kingdom that *is of this world*, cannot acknowledge any as the ſubjects of his government, who do not know and revere him; who do not really confide in him and ſincerely love him. He diſdains to be called *the King*, or *the God*, of any perſon who does not obey and worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth. Agreeably to which, when, as a ſpiritual King, he appointed baptiſm; it was in cloſe connection with *previous inſtruction*, and limited (as far as appears from his own language, or from apoſtolic practice) to thoſe who profeſs, repentance for ſin, faith in his blood, and ſubjection to his authority as the Lord of conſcience: without ſaying a word, or giving the leaſt intimation, that the being deſcended from ſuch, or ſuch parents, intitles either one or another to that inſtitution. See Mat. iii. 7, 8, 9. and xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Acts viii. 36, 37. 1 Pet. iii. 21. To infer, therefore, that baptiſm belongs to infants, becauſe infants were circumciſed when the church was, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, *national*—when Jehovah ſuſtained the character of a *political* monarch—when the *ſlave* of an Iſraelite, though deſcended from idolatrous parents, had an equal title to the ceremony with his maſter's offspring—when a profeſſion, of repentance for ſin, of a believing regard to the Lord Meſſiah, or of ſincere love to God, as the giver of ſpiritual bleſſings, was *not required of any* to qualify them for it—and when the law of adminiſtration expreſſly determined, that *carnal deſcent* from Abraham inveſted all his male poſterity with a claim on the ordinance—to infer, I ſay, that baptiſm belongs

to

to infants, though all theſe thing are *now reverſed*, is a ſtrange concluſion!

Further: That baptiſm did not come in the place of circumciſion, we have the ſtrongeſt preſumptive evidence. To what Profeſſor VENEMA has urged, No. 11. we may add; If baptiſm ſucceeded in the place of circumciſion, how came it about that both of them were in *full* force at the *ſame* time; that is, from the commencement of John's miniſtry, to the death of Chriſt? If one inſtitution ſucceed in the place of another, we are unavoidably led to conſider that other, as having *vacated* its place; or elſe we cannot conceive how there ſhould be room for it. For one thing to come in *the room* of another, and the latter ſtill hold its place, is an *odd kind* of ſucceſſion. —Again: Admitting the ſucceſſion pretended, how came it that Paul circumciſed Timothy, after he had been baptized? For this, on the principle here oppoſed, there does not appear the leaſt reaſon.—Further: Had the ſuppoſed ſucceſſion been a real fact, not only the Apoſtles, but all the apoſtolic churches, muſt have known it. What was the reaſon, then, that ſo many of the Jewiſh converts were highly diſguſted at the thought of circumciſion being laid aſide? Why ſuch warm endeavours to ſupport the credit of an ancient ceremony, which they themſelves muſt have known to be obſolete, for this very reaſon, *Baptiſm came in its room.* Or, if the fire of zeal and the force of prejudice had blinded *their* minds to ſo juſt an inference; yet, ſurely, the *Apoſtles* and *Elders*, when aſſembled at Jeruſalem to ſettle the unhappy diſpute, were not inveloped in the ſame injurious error. And how natural would it have been for that venerable aſſembly, to have given ſome intimation of this preſumed ſucceſſion, if they had known any thing of it? How natural alſo for Paul, in his controverſial

troverſial Epiſtle to the Galatians, to have ſaid ſomething about it? For that, in all probability, would have been the direct way to determine the diſpute at once. On the principles of our opponents, the holy Apoſtles, and the venerable elders of thoſe times, were all *Pædobaptiſts*; but there is not the leaſt appearance of their acting in this controverſy like perſons of that character. For had a convention of modern Pædobaptiſts occupied the place of that honourable aſſembly at Jeruſalem, a great majority of them, there is reaſon to believe, would have agreed in addreſſing the Jewiſh bigots to this effect: "Do not you know, Brethren, or have you forgotten, that *baptiſm* came in the place of circumciſion, and that it is emphatically called, THE CHRISTIAN CIRCUMCISION? We are ſurpriſed to think, that a fact ſo notorious, and a ſentiment ſo common in all the churches, ſhould be thus overlooked and practically denied by you!" But not a word like this, in any account of that diſpute contained in the New Teſtament.

Once more: As this analogical kind of reaſoning from an obſolete rite of the Old OEconomy, to an appointment of the New Teſtament, is inconſiſtent with the nature of a *poſitive* inſtitution, as appears from CHAPTER I. and as it is a tacit confeſſion, that Evangeliſts and Apoſtles afford but ſlender evidence in proof of the point which our Brethren wiſh to eſtabliſh; ſo, many of them cannot but know, that, by this very method of arguing, Papiſts endeavour to prove, the lawfulneſs of *women* baptizing, in caſes of ſuppoſed neceſſity; becauſe the wife of Moſes performed the rite of circumciſion upon her ſons—that the church of Chriſt ſhould have a *viſible head*; becauſe the Jewiſh church had

had a high prieſt—that the true church muſt be *infallible*; becauſe the ancient high prieſt, by conſulting Urim on certain occaſions, delivered oracles—and that there muſt be *ſeven* ſacraments; becauſe the number ſeven makes a conſpicuous figure in the Hebrew ritual.—Nor need the Proteſtant Diſſenting Pædobaptiſts to be informed, that our Engliſh Epiſcopalians, being conſcious the New Teſtament knows nothing of a *national* church—of their *hierarchy*—of a *ſtrict alliance* between the church and the ſtate—of the *divine right* of tythes, for the ſupport of Chriſtian miniſters—of *canonical habits*—of *inſtrumental muſic*, in divine worſhip—nor yet of their *holy days*—have recourſe to the antiquated Jewiſh OEconomy, in defence of theſe particulars. And why may not theſe things be defended on the ground of analogy, by Papiſts, or Proteſtant Epiſcopalians, as well as Infant baptiſm? Why ſhould any of our Diſſenting Brethren conſider circumciſion as the *only* poſitive appointment of the Old Teſtament, that is intitled to ſuch a directive influence on Chriſtian worſhip and order? What paſſage of Scripture, or what reaſon, can be aſſigned for this pre-eminence? Had not thoſe ancient rites the ſame Author? Were not their obligation and uſe limited to the ſame period? Why, then, ſhould circumciſion, which had more of a *political* nature in it than any of them, ſtill exert its influence on our minds, above all the other branches of an antiquated ſyſtem, and concur in directing us whom to baptize? Roman Catholics, and Engliſh Epiſcopalians, are manifeſtly more conſiſtent with themſelves, in this reſpect, than thoſe Proteſtant Diſſenters who argue for Infant baptiſm, from Infant circumciſion. Thoſe of our Brethren, however, be they Conformiſts, or Nonconformiſts, who argue from the inſtitutions

of

of Judaiſm, to the poſitive rights of Chriſtianity, may do well to conſider, whether that principle of reaſoning, if purſued, would not lead them back to the church of Rome: becauſe there is a greater conformity to the Moſaic ritual in that communion, than in any other*.

REFLECT. III. Paul having informed us, that Abraham *received the ſign of circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*; the generality of our oppoſers agree in denominating baptiſm a *ſeal* of the Chriſtian covenant. Some of them, however, coincide with us, in queſtioning the propriety of ſuch language; as Mr. BAXTER has obſerved, in the following words. "Some ſober men, no way inclined to Anabaptiſm, do think that we ought not to call the ſacraments *ſeals*, as being a thing not to be proved by the word†." And, certainly, if Dr. LIGHTFOOT's verſion of Rom. iv. 11. and his obſervation upon it, be juſt; there can be little reaſon for calling *baptiſm* a ſeal of the covenant, on account of circumciſion being denominated a *ſeal* of righteouſneſs. His tranſlation of the text, and part of his remark upon it, are as follow. "*And he received the ſign of circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of the faith, which* SHOULD HEREAFTER BE *in uncircumciſion.* Which *ſhould be*, not which *had been.* Not, what had been to *Abraham*, as yet uncircumciſed; but which ſhould be to *his ſeed* uncircumciſed; that is, to *Gentiles* that ſhould hereafter imitate the faith of Abraham‡." Which verſion and interpretation are agreeable, ſo far as I can perceive, both to the ſcope of the paſſage and the letter of

* See AINSWORTH's *Arrow againſt Idolatry*, p. 81, 82. † *Apology againſt* Mr. BLAKE, § LXIV. p. 118. ‡ *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on 1 Cor. vii 19, *Works*, Vol. II. p. 761.

of the text. For the Apoſtle does not repreſent circumciſion as a ſeal of righteouſneſs to the Jews, *in common*; but to Abraham, *in particular*.—But ſuppoſing the baptiſm of Paul, for inſtance, had been expreſſly called *a ſeal of righteouſneſs*, or of *the covenant*; we could not with propriety have thence inferred, that *Pædobaptiſm* ſhould be ſo conſidered. For Mr. CHARNOCK has taught us thus to reaſon: "God *ſeals* no more than he *promiſes*, nor in any other manner than as he promiſes. He promiſes only to *faith*, and therefore only *ſeals* to faith. Covenant graces therefore muſt be *poſſeſt* and *acted*, before covenant bleſſings *can be ratified* to us*." Now if this reaſoning be good, it is quite inconceivable how baptiſm can be a ſeal of the covenant to infants, that know nothing about, either the promiſes, the bleſſings, or the duties of that gracious conſtitution. Or, if our Brethren muſt needs call it a ſeal of the covenant, we deſire to be informed, what *ſpiritual bleſſing* it aſcertains, really aſcertains to infants, any more than to unbelieving adults, who have at any time been baptized; or than circumciſion, to ſimilar characters, under the former OEconomy? Millions of Jews were circumciſed in their infancy, and numbers of proſelytes, who lived and died in rebellion againſt the government and grace of God. Simon the ſorcerer, *profeſſing* faith in Jeſus Chriſt, though he had it not, was baptized by Philip; and many, no doubt, in former and latter ages, have been baptized on a ſimilar profeſſion, whoſe conduct diſgraced the Chriſtian character. Now muſt we conſider theſe, *all* theſe, as having had the *righteouſneſs of faith*, or *the covenant of grace*, RATIFIED or SEALED to

* *Works*, Vol. II. p. 781. Edit. 1.

them? Far be it! Why, then, ſhould baptiſm be repreſented at every turn, and without heſitation, as *a ſeal* of the covenant, when applied to *infants?*

SECT. IV.

Particular Paſſages of Scripture.

§ I. MAT. xxviii. 19. *Go ye, therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

DR. DODDRIDGE: "I render the word μαθητευσατε, *proſelyte*, that it may be duly diſtinguiſhed from διδασκοντες, *teaching* (in the next verſe) with which our verſion confounds it. The *former* ſeems to import inſtruction in the eſſentials of religion, which it was neceſſary adult perſons ſhould know and ſubmit to, before they could regularly be admitted to baptiſm; the *latter* may relate to thoſe more particular admonitions in regard to Chriſtian faith and practice, which were to be built on that foundation." *Note*, on the place.

2. GROTIUS: "Seeing there is a twofold kind of teaching, the one by way of introduction to the *firſt principles*, the other by way of *more perfect* inſtruction; the former ſeems to be intended by the word μαθητευειν, for that is as it were to initiate into diſcipline, and is to go before baptiſm: the latter is intended by the word διδασκειν, which is here placed after baptiſm." *In loc.*

3. Dr. HAMMOND: "Call all nations to diſcipleſhip; or *inſtruct* them in the faith and diſcipline. Teſtify the reſurrection of Chriſt to all, and by preaching

preaching the goſpel in all parts, gather diſciples; and, having gathered them, baptize and teach them." *Diſſertat. de Epiſcop.* in Mr. REES's *Inf. Bap. no Inſtitut. of Chriſt*, p. 7.

4. Mr. BAXTER: "This is not like ſome occaſional hiſtorical mention of baptiſm, but it's the very *commiſſion* of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, for preaching and baptizing, and purpoſely expreſſeth their ſeveral works, in their ſeveral places and order. Their firſt taſk is *by teaching* to make diſciples, which are, by Mark, called *believers*. The ſecond work is, to *baptize* them, whereto is annexed the promiſe of their ſalvation. The third work is to teach them *all other things* which are afterwards to be learned in the ſchool of Chriſt. To contemn *this order*, is to renounce *all rules of order*; for where can we expect to find it, if not *here?* I profeſs, my conſcience is fully ſatisfied from this text, that it is *one ſort* of faith, even *ſaving*, that muſt go before baptiſm, and the profeſſion whereof the miniſter muſt expect." *Diſputations of Right to Sac.* p. 149, 150.

5. HOORNBEEKIUS: "Μαθητευσατε, indeed, properly ſignifies to *make a diſciple*; but ſeeing that is not done without *inſtruction*, it is tantamount to *teach*." *Socin. Confut.* Tom. III. L. III. C. IV. p. 325.

6. Dr. RIDGLEY: "*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptiſing them*, &c. and in Mark xvi. 15. *Go ye into all the world and preach the goſpel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved*, &c. I am ſenſible that ſome, who have defended Infant baptiſm, or rather attempted to anſwer an objection taken from this, and ſuch like Scriptures againſt it, have endeavoured to prove that the Greek word ſignifies, *make* perſons *diſciples*; and [that] accordingly, it is a metaphor taken from the

the practice of a perſon's being put under the care of one who is qualified to inſtruct him, whoſe diſciple he is ſaid to be, in order to his being taught by him: and therefore they ſuppoſe, that we are made diſciples by baptiſm, and afterwards to be *taught to obſerve all things whatſoever Chriſt hath commanded*—But, I cannot think this ſenſe of the word ſo defenſible, or agreeable to the deſign of our Saviour, as that of our tranſlation, viz, *Go* TEACH *all nations:* which agrees with the words of the other Evangeliſt, *Go preach the goſpel to every creature.* And beſides, while we have recourſe to this ſenſe to defend Infant baptiſm, we do not rightly conſider that this cannot well be applied to *adult* baptiſm, which the Apoſtles were *firſt* to practiſe: for it cannot be ſaid concerning the Heathen, that they are firſt to be taken under Chriſt's care by *baptiſm*, and *then inſtructed* in the doctrines of the goſpel, by his miniſters." *Body of Div.* Queſt. CLXVI. p. 602. *Glaſgow*, 1770.

7. CAMERO: "Μαθητευειν, is to *teach* thoſe things that pertain to religion." Apud POLI *Synopſ.* in loc.

8. CALVIN: "Becauſe Chriſt requires *teaching*, before baptizing, and will have believers only admitted to baptiſm; baptiſm does not ſeem to be rightly adminiſtered, except faith precede. Under this pretence, the Anabaptiſts have loudly clamoured againſt Pædobaptiſm." *In Harm. Evang. Comment.* ad loc.

9. Mr. POOLE'S CONTINUATORS: "*Go ye therefore and teach all nations.* The Greek is, μαθητευσατε, *make diſciples* all nations; but that muſt be firſt by *preaching* and *inſtructing* them in the principles of the Chriſtian faith: and Mark expounds it, telling us our Lord ſaid, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature*; that is, to every reaſonable creature capable of hearing and receiving

receiving it. I cannot be of their mind, who think that perſons may be baptized *before* they be taught: we want *precedents* of any ſuch baptiſm in Scripture; though indeed we find precedents of perſons baptized, who had but a ſmall degree of the knowledge of the goſpel; but it ſhould ſeem that they were *all* firſt taught, that *Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of God*, and were not baptized till they profeſſed ſuch belief, Acts viii. 37. and John baptized them in Jordan, *confeſſing their ſins*, Mat. iii. 6." *Annotat.* on the place.

10. BECKMANUS: "That the word μαθητευειν, according to its etymology, ſignifies *to make diſciples*, is readily allowed by all. But that is not effected without *inſtruction*. For he who, as μαθητης, learns from another, is rationally *taught ſomething* by him. They, therefore, are diſciples, who are *taught* and *learn*——Hence, μαθητευω, is to *teach* and *inſtruct* others. Μαθητευσατε, therefore, in Mat. xxviii. 19. is, as BEZA tranſlates it, to *make diſciples*, or to *teach*. Our adverſaries, therefore, cannot gain any thing thence, in defence of their cauſe. For how are people made the *diſciples* of Chriſt? Certainly, by *teaching*. Hence the Syriac interpreter; *Teach all people*. Yea, Mark plainly intimates, that the goſpel was to be *preached*, or *inſtruction* communicated, to the nations; ſaying, *Go into all the world, preach the goſpel to every creature:* thus explaining το μαθητευσατε, in Matthew." *Exercitat. Theolog.* Exercit. XVII. p. 260.

11. Dr. BARROW: "What the action itſelf injoined is, what the manner and form thereof, is apparent by the words of our Lord's inſtitution: *Going forth*, ſaith he, *teach*, or diſciple, *all nations*, *baptizing them*, &c. The *action* is *baptizing*, or *immerſing*

immerſing in water; the *object* thereof, thoſe perſons of any nation, whom his miniſters can, by their *inſtruction* and *perſuaſion*, render diſciples; that is, ſuch as do *ſincerely believe* the truth of his doctrine, and *ſeriouſly reſolve* to obey his commandments." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 518. Edit. 1722.

12. MASTRICHT: "Our Saviour commands, firſt, to *make diſciples*, or Chriſtians; then to *baptize*." *Theoret. Pract. Theolog.* L. VII. C. IV. § 10.

13. Bp. BURNET: "By the firſt preaching, or making of diſciples that *muſt go before* baptiſm, is to be meant the convincing the world that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the true Meſſias, anointed of God with a fulneſs of grace and of the Spirit without meaſure, and ſent to be the Saviour and Redeemer of the world. And when any were brought to acknowledge this, *then* they were to baptize them, to initiate them in his religion, by obliging them to renounce all ungodlineſs, as well as all ſecular and carnal luſts." *Expoſ. XXXIX Articles*, p. 374.

14. Dr. WHITBY: "Μαθητευειν here, is *to preach the goſpel to all nations*, and to engage them to believe it, in order to their profeſſion of that faith by baptiſm; as ſeems apparent, (1) from the parallel commiſſion, Mark xvi. 15. *Go preach the goſpel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* (2) From the Scripture notion of a *diſciple*, that being ſtill the ſame as *a believer*——If here it ſhould be ſaid that I yield too much to the Antipædobaptiſts, by ſaying, that to be made diſciples here, is *to be taught to believe in Chriſt*; I deſire any one to tell me how the Apoſtles could μαθητευειν, *make a diſciple* of an Heathen, or unbelieving Jew, without being μαθηται, or *teachers* of them; whether they were not ſent to preach to thoſe that could hear, and to teach them to whom they preached, that *Jeſus was the Chriſt*, and

and only to baptize them when they did believe this." *Annotat.* on the place.

15. VENEMA: "*Go*, ſaith our Lord to the Apoſtles, *teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* This is an excellent paſſage, and explains the whole nature of baptiſm. Before perſons were baptized, it was neceſſary for them to believe the preaching of the Apoſtles; which faith they were to profeſs in baptiſm. For the word μαθητευειν, in the ſtile of the New Teſtament, does not ſignify *barely to admit into a ſchool and inſtruction*; but to admit, after the doctrine is believed, and after a previous ſubjection to the fundamental laws of the ſchool. Μαθητευειν τινα, is *to teach a perſon* effectually, ſo that he may learn, obey, and receive the doctrine by faith. It includes, therefore, ακουειν και μαθειν, to *hear*, to *underſtand*, and to *admit for true*; for μανθανειν, *to learn*, ſignifies an idea diſtinct from ακουσαι, to *hear*. Vid RAPHELIUS ad Joh. vi. 45. One paſſage, Acts xiv. 21. ſhall ſuffice for the preſent. Paul and Barnabas ευαγγελισαμενοι τε την πολιν εκεινην και μαθητευσαντες ικανους, *when they had preached the goſpel to that city, and had taught many, returned to Lyſtra.* So the Vulgate renders the words; and, indeed, not improperly, if you underſtand to *teach* effectually; ſo that they not only *heard* what pertained to the goſpel miniſtry, but alſo by faith received it, and gave up themſelves to Chriſt; which is μανθανειν, to *learn*, to *approve*. From which place it is evident, that μαθητευειν requires preceding *inſtruction*, by which a perſon is both taught and perſuaded. Our Lord has the ſame thing in his eye, in the paſſage before us; nor is the Greek word uſed in a different

different ſenſe, Mat. xiii. 52. Further: The illuſtrious GROTIUS, on the paſſage, has well obſerved; That Chriſt by this word properly requires τὴν κατήχησιν, the teaching of the *firſt elements* of Chriſtianity, as preceding baptiſm; which alſo was *always* uſed in the church, previous to that ordinance. By which if any one had obtained a knowledge of the truth, profeſſed faith in Chriſt, and evidenced a readineſs to perform all the commands of our Lord, he was *baptized*. The author of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, which bear the name of CLEMENT, already cited by GROTIUS, very well expreſſes the ſenſe. *It behoves you firſt, to eradicate all impiety; then to implant godlineſs in them; and ſo to judge them worthy of baptiſm.* With which EPIPHANIUS agrees: *Teach all nations: that is, bring them over from impiety to truth,* and ſo on. I know, indeed, that there are every where many who are averſe from the interpretation juſt given, becauſe it ſeems contrary to the *baptiſm of infants*. But they fear without reaſon. For though Chriſt ſpeaks ONLY *concerning the baptiſm of adults*; that Pædobaptiſm is *commanded*, may, indeed, be denied; but that it is therefore *unlawful*, or to be *omitted*, it by no means demonſtrates. Beſides, ſeeing infants, while deſtitute of reaſon, are conſidered as in their parents; in them, and by them, they both profeſs faith and are baptized: and ſo I would not here exclude infants; they being comprehended in their parents. But ſince they ſhould not be admitted, except on account of their parents; inſtruction and faith ought, certainly, to precede baptiſm: wherefore, adults make a *perſonal* profeſſion of faith, and infants by *their parents*. Our Lord, therefore, without endangering the baptiſm of infants, might well command

mand his diſciples to *teach all nations:* for thoſe infants, that were baptized, were conſidered as members of their parents; becauſe, if the parents had not been taught, none of their infants could have been baptized." *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. II C. XIV. § 6.——See alſo Mr. PERKINS's *Works*, Vol. II. p. 257. and MACCOVII *Loci Com.* Cap. LXXIX. p. 823.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It appears, by theſe quotations, That this paſſage is of *peculiar* importance, in regard to the work of our Lord's miniſters. See No 4. 15.—That theſe reſpectable authors agree in conſidering the word μαθητευσατε, as a command to *teach*, in diſtinction from the act of baptizing. See No 1—15.—That the paſſage thus underſtood, ſtands acquitted from the charge of tautology; μαθητευσατε, relating to inſtruction in the *firſt principles* of Chriſtianity, and διδασκοντες, to a *more perfect* information in the doctrines, duties, and privileges, reſulting from thoſe fundamental principles. See No 1, 2.—That *diſciples*, here, and *believers*, in Mark xvi. 15, 16. are the ſame perſons. See No 4. 6. 9, 10. 14.—That the order appointed by Chriſt, is, firſt, to *teach*; then, to *baptize*; and, that ancient eccleſiaſtical authors did ſo underſtand it. See No 4. 15.—That ſlighting this order, is deſpiſing all rules of order. See No 4.—That a diſciple cannot be made without *teaching*, and that it is inconſiſtent with the plain deſign of the paſſage to underſtand it otherwiſe. See No 5, 6. 9, 10. 14.—That a regard to the *credit* of Infant baptiſm, rather than any thing in the term itſelf, has led many learned men to interpret the word μαθητευσατε, ſo as to exclude the idea of *in-*

ſtruction. See No 6. 14, 15.—And, that Chriſt, in this paſſage, ſpeaks only concerning the baptiſm of *adults.* See No 15. Such are the conceſſions, and ſuch the reaſonings of Pædobaptiſts themſelves, on this important paſſage.

REFLECT. II. As this inſtructive text is the firſt appointment of baptiſm for the uſe of *Gentiles,* and as it is the law of adminiſtration to the end of time, ſo it cannot but require the moſt ſubmiſſive regard. For Jeſus Chriſt, on this occaſion, expreſſly claims *all authority in heaven and on earth.* He plainly appears as King of Zion, and Sovereign of the world. His language, here, is not a mere *alluſion* to baptiſm, nor an *incidental* uſe of the term, in which caſes words are often applied in a laxer ſenſe; but it is the *inſtitution* of that ordinance, it is DIVINE LAW; and therefore the expreſſions contained in it, muſt be underſtood in their natural and obvious meaning, except any abſurdity would follow ſuch a conſtruction of the ſacred ſtatute. Nor, could it be proved, that μαθητευσατε, ſometimes conveys the idea of making diſciples, where there is *no teaching*; and, that βαπτιζοντες, is occaſionally uſed for pouring, or ſprinkling, where there is *no immerſion*; yet the diſpute between us and our Brethren would not be decided: becauſe this queſtion would ſtill remain for diſcuſſion; Is making a diſciple *without inſtruction,* in the one caſe; and *pouring* or *ſprinkling,* in the other; the NATURAL and PRIMARY ſignification of thoſe Greek words? Are *theſe* the ſenſes of thoſe terms that would naturally *firſt* occur to the mind of a wiſe and impartial perſon, on reading or hearing this law of baptiſm? If not, we may ſafely conclude, they are neither of them pertinent here; becauſe each of theſe emphatical words, making a capital figure in the heavenly edict, ſhould be underſtood

underſtood in its *moſt plain*, and *common*, and *expreſſive ſignification:* for, as to any *abſurdity* following upon it, our opponents pretend none, but what implies a begging of the queſtion diſputed.—Quite pertinent is an obſervation of Mr. CHARNOCK, relating to matters of this kind; which, though quoted before, I will again tranſcribe. "'Tis a part of God's ſovereignty, to be the interpreter, as well as the maker of his own laws; as it is a right inherent in the legiſlative power among men. So that it is *an invaſion* of his right to faſten a ſenſe upon his declared will, which doth not *naturally* flow from the words. For to put any interpretation according to our pleaſure upon divine as well as human laws, contrary to their true intent, is a virtual uſurpation of this power: becauſe if laws may be interpreted according to our humours, the power of the law would be more in the interpreter, than in the legiſlator *."—Now that the *natural* and *primary*, if not the *only* ſignification of the word μαθητευσα, is to make diſciples *by teaching*, Dr. GALE has inconteſtibly proved by appealing to, Greek Claſſics, the ancient Fathers, the numerous Oriental and European verſions of the text, modern critics, and various lexicographers †. Were any one required, therefore, to explain the divine mandate before us, on the perilous condition impoſed by ZALEUCUS upon the contentious interpreters of his laws, as mentioned by POLYBIUS; or on that of the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt, when contending about the temple, as narrated by JOSEPHUS ‡; he would certainly adhere more cloſely to the *natural* and *proper* ſenſe of the terms than many

* *On Man's Enmity to God*, p. 98. † *Reflections on* Dr WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Lett. VII, VIII.

‡ Apud WITSIUM, *OEcon. Fœd.* L. I. C. I. § I.

many of our opponents do, leſt he ſhould end his life by the halter.

On the principle of reaſoning here adopted, Pædobaptiſts themſelves proceed, when diſputing on other ſubjects. To the ſeveral quotations produced in CHAP. II. REFLECT. III. in reference to this affair; I would here add the following extracts from Mr. ROBERT FERGUSON. "If men may be permitted to forſake the *natural* and *genuine* ſenſe of words, where the matter is capable of it; they may, notwithſtanding their declaring themſelves to believe the goſpel, yet believe nothing at all of the Chriſtian faith——*We are not to forſake the genuine and natural ſignification of words, unleſs there be the* HIGHEST EVIDENCE *that the author did otherwiſe intend them*, ſaith the Civil Law. And, as AUSTIN ſays, *The proper ſignification of words is always to be retained, unleſs* NECESSITY *inforce us to expound them otherwiſe.* Every Scripture expreſſion, word, and phraſe, is to be taken properly, and according to its original and immediate meaning, if nothing of abſurdity, nothing repugnant to faith, or diſagreeable to the common notices of mankind, ariſe or enſue upon ſuch an acceptation. There is no bounding of a roving fancy, which loves to ſport itſelf with the ideas and phantaſms itſelf has raiſed, without confining ourſelves within the foreſaid limits ——What better evidence can we have of the ſenſe of a place, than that, had an author *intended* ſuch a meaning, he could have uſed no plainer expreſſion to declare it *?"—Thus Mr. FERGUSON, when writing againſt the Socinianizing SHERLOCK; thus the generality of learned authors, when confuting the Socinian ſyſtem; and thus the Baptiſts, in oppoſition to Infant ſprinkling.

REFLECT.

* *Intereſt of Reaſon in Relig.* p. 328. 333, 334. 462.

REFLECT. III. If this law of the Lord have any regard to inſtruction, as a prerequiſite for baptiſm; that inſtruction muſt be required, either of *all*, or only of *ſome*. To affirm the *latter*, there is not the leaſt ground in this divine canon; becauſe it makes no diſtinction between what is required of ſome, and what is demanded of others: yet this very paſſage is the great law of proceeding. Nor ought that hoary maxim of legal interpretation to be haſtily caſt aſide; "*We* muſt not diſtinguiſh, where the *law* does not diſtinguiſh." For if diſtinctions and exceptions may be deviſed, in expounding poſitive laws, unleſs a real neceſſity urge; we may ſoon accommodate any of them to almoſt any hypotheſis. It remains, then, that *all* muſt be taught, that *all* muſt become diſciples, before they are baptized. Now Dr. GOODWIN aſſures us, "A *diſciple* is not one that heareth one leſſon only; but a diſciple is a conſtant hearer, and one that taketh himſelf bound to take out all the leſſons that he heareth, and to ſubmit to the diſcipline of the ſchool*."

REFLECT. IV. The different views which learned Pædobaptiſts have of this capital text, are very remarkable: for, while Profeſſor ARNOLD maintains, that "the baptiſm of infants is either commanded *here*, or no *where*†;" Profeſſor VENEMA frankly confeſſes, that our Lord ſpeaks concerning the baptiſm of *adults* only. See No 15. Thus doctors differ. Strange, however, as it may ſeem, I have the ſingular happineſs to agree with them both. Conſidering this text as the great law of baptiſm, I concur with the *former* in concluding; That if there be no requiſition of Infant baptiſm *here*, it is in vain to

* *Church Order, by way of Catechiſm*, p. 30. *Works*, Vol. IV.

† *Religio Sociniana*, p. 411.

to ſeek for one any where elſe. On the other hand, I am equally clear the *latter* is much in the right, when he gives it as his opinion; That our Lord, in this paſſage, does *not* command the baptiſm of infants: and my concluſion is, that they ought not to be baptized.—But though that great man, VENEMA, acknowledges the want of a command for Pædobaptiſm, he nevertheleſs maintains the lawfulneſs of it. A little reflection, however, may ſerve to convince a conſiſtent Proteſtant, that the baptiſm of infants cannot be lawful, in the eye of this commiſſion, if not required by our divine Lawgiver. For when that rite is performed, it is, not as an *indifferent* thing, nor yet as a *civil* affair; but *in the* NAME *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* The adminiſtrator, therefore, expreſſly claims a *divine warrant* for what he does, and the whole ceremony is conſidered as an act of divine worſhip. Nay, in this light it is commonly viewed, though ſecularized by *proxies*, who engage for the child—by the *repreſentatives* of proxies, who engage for them—and by its frequent attendant, a *ſumptuous, noiſy feaſt**.—If, then, the baptiſm of infants be not commanded, and if there be no precedent for it in the ſacred Code; it muſt fall under the cenſure of that query, *Who hath required this at your hands?* In this particular alſo, as well as in other things, we have the pleaſure to find that ſome Pædobaptiſts agree with us. OEDERUS, for inſtance, when contending with the Socinians, ſays; "Seeing

* Dr. WALL, when animadverting on ſuch a carnal conduct, ſays; "Very few of the company join in the prayers; but only in the feaſting and carnal jollity, which is too often carried on to ſuch exceſs, as is more likely to bring a curſe than a bleſſing upon the whole undertaking." *Def. Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 409.

"Seeing we do not adminiſter Pædobaptiſm as an *indifferent* thing,—if we err, it muſt be, not a *trifling*, but a *very grievous* error; and to be condemned, as an *abuſe* of God's moſt holy name, which we believe is uſed by us in a holy manner, when we baptize infants*."

We are, indeed, ſometimes told, that if our Lord had ſaid, "Go *circumciſe* all nations;" every one would have admitted, that infants were included. True; but why ſtop at *infants?* Would there not have been equal reaſon to infer, that the male *ſervants* of thoſe maſters who ſubmitted to the painful rite, were alſo to be circumciſed, whether they profeſſed repentance towards God and faith in the Meſſiah, or not? Or, would every one have drawn the ſuppoſed concluſion, if the command had run thus; "Go, *teach* all nations, circumciſing them?" By no means: for then the adminiſtration of that appointment would have been conſidered as limited to ſuch as were *taught*; becauſe the command would have expreſſly varied from the original order, Gen. xvii. 10—13. What ſhould hinder us, then, from drawing the ſame concluſion in the preſent caſe?

REFLECT. V. As this law of baptiſm ſays not a word about infants, if any of them be intitled to that ordinance, it muſt be becauſe the great Legiſlator tacitly intended they ſhould be baptized. That ſuppoſed intention, however, not being expreſſed, and ſo not limited to any deſcription of infants; may as well be extended to *all*, as to *ſome*. Why, then, are not *all* infants, whom there is an opportunity of baptizing, diſcipled by a participation of the ordinance? eſpecially as our Brethren conclude, that the New Teſtament OEconomy ſhould be conſidered, not as *leſs*, but as *more* favourable to infants, than the

* *Catecheſis Racovienſis*, p. 557.

the Jewiſh Diſpenſation was. Nay, why ſhould not every *adult* alſo, that is willing, be thus diſciples? For, if Chriſt commanded that all nations ſhould be *diſciples by baptiſm*, as many of our oppoſers contend; and if infants have a claim on the ordinance, becauſe they are *part* of the nations, as we have often been told; why, in the name of millions, are infants to be treated as the *only proper ſubjects* of that diſcipleſhip? Are not *unbelieving adults* alſo, a part of the nations? Why ſhould thoſe words, *all nations*, be conſtrued as embracing infants and ſmiling upon them; but as rejecting a great majority of adults with an indignant frown; while both are conſidered as unregenerate, and as equally ignorant of evangelical truth? Or, is it a qualification eſſentially neceſſary in a proper ſubject of diſcipleſhip by baptiſm, to be *without the exerciſe of reaſon?* This, indeed, ſeems to be the caſe, on the hypotheſis of many who now oppoſe us: but then that diſcipleſhip certainly has the appearance of a *very irrational* thing.

I ſaid, of *many* who oppoſe us; not of *all*. For, not to mention the Roman Catholics, there are ſome authors of note among the Reformed, of different communions, who ſeem to have conſidered the text before us, as warranting the baptiſm of *all* without exception. Thus, for example, that famous Lutheran, CALOVIUS, argues: "He who commands all men to be baptized, ſo that *none are excepted*, of any age, or ſex, or condition, would have infants baptized, no leſs than adults. But Chriſt commands *all men* to be baptized. Therefore, and ſo on*." Dr. JOHN EDWARDS alſo, when expreſſing his view of the paſſage, ſays; "This general commiſſion takes in *all* particulars. *Go, baptize all nations*, is as much

* *Socinianiſ. Profligat.* Diſp. XXIV. Controv. VIII. p. 878. Witteberg. 1652.

much and as full as if Chriſt had ſaid, Go, baptize *all men, women,* and *children**." And whether the following argument of Mr. HENRY does not involve the ſame idea, let the Reader determine. "If it be the will and command of the Lord Jeſus, that all nations ſhould be diſciples by baptiſm; and children, though a part of all nations, are not excepted, then children are to be diſciples by baptiſm. I ſay, *diſciples by baptiſm*, for that is plainly intended by the words of the inſtitution, Mat. xxviii. 19. (μαθητευσατε βαπτιζοντες) *admit them diſciples by baptizing them*, as was ſhewed before. The command is to *diſciple* them; *baptizing* them is the mode of executing that command—And *all nations* are to be *ſo* diſciples—i. e. all conſenting nations. If any communities or individuals refuſed, [i. e. to be diſciples by baptiſm] the Apoſtles were to ſhake off the duſt off their feet againſt them, as having no lot or part in the matter. And ſurely infants are a part of nations; and in the diſcipling of nations, not a *diſſenting* part, but a *conſenting*, by thoſe who are the truſtees of their wills. And our Lord hath not excepted them—In this *magna charta* therefore, we leave the cauſe of infants fully vindicated; and are willing to ſtand or fall by this commiſſion †."—I cannot but wonder, that an author of Mr. HENRY's learning, parts, and piety, ſhould reaſon after this manner, and lay ſuch a ſtreſs upon it! In his eſteem, the argument is nothing ſhort of demonſtration: while, nevertheleſs, if it prove any thing at all it is, That the idea of *teaching*, is not included in the text—That *all adults*, of all nations, who have no reluctance to it, ſhould be baptized—And, that *all* children are to be baptized, *volentes nolentes*, provided the *truſtees* of their

* *Theologia Reformata*, Vol. I. p. 568.

† *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 114, 115, 116.

their wills do but conſent. So particular, ſo explicit, and ſo ſtrong, is the *Magna Charta* of Infant baptiſm! But what would Britons think, were their civil rights no better ſecured by the Great Charter of England?

Here one can hardly forbear to remark, in what *oppoſite* ways this capital text is interpreted, to make it agree with different hypotheſes. For, while SOCINUS, and many of his followers, cannot diſcern the leaſt veſtige of baptiſm in *water* being required by the heavenly edict, and allow of nothing but miniſterial *inſtruction* being injoined; Mr. HENRY and others, when arguing upon it, find nothing commanded but *baptiſm*, and exclude the idea of *teaching*, as if it were quite foreign to the deſign of our Lord. The *former* would baptize, barely by *teaching*; the *latter* would make diſciples, merely by *baptizing*. I cannot help thinking, however, that it would puzzle the ſubtility of a SOCINUS, to ſatisfy the demand of Chriſt in the term βαπτιζοντες, without the uſe of *water*; and that it would equally nonplus the ingenuity of a HENRY, to fulfil the requiſition of our Lord in the word μαθητευσατε, without the labour of *teaching*. But, in ſpite of the natural and obvious meaning of theſe enacting terms of divine law, the loud calls of hypotheſes muſt be heard! For were it allowed, that our great Sovereign *meant* what his language properly ſignifies, it would inevitably follow, that immerſion in water is a *divine appointment*, in oppoſition to SOCINUS; and that Pædobaptiſm is deſtitute of a *Magna Charta*, in contradiction to Mr. HENRY.

Further: Whatever diſcipleſhip our Lord meant by the word μαθητευσατε, or however it may be effected; it is plain, that he has not given the leaſt intimation, in this

this text, of *two* ſorts of diſciples, that are made ſo by different means—not a hint, about ſome being diſcipled by *baptiſm*, and others by *the truth*. The diſcipleſhip intended, therefore, muſt be *one*, and effected in the *ſame way*. Conſequently, while our opponents maintain their interpretation of this paſſage, conſiſtency requires, that not only infants, but all unconverted adults, who deſire it, ſhould be diſcipled by being baptized. For as this capital text knows of but one *baptiſm*; ſo it is acquainted with only *one diſcipleſhip* and *one way* of obtaining it.

Many of our oppoſers, however, do not admire this neceſſary conſequence of their own reaſoning on the paſſage. They will not allow ſuch an extent of deſign in the great Lord of the ordinance, either as to adults, or infants. The commiſſion for baptiſm, therefore, muſt be underſtood in a *limited* ſenſe. This we readily grant. By what then is it limited? By the ſecret intention of Chriſt? but that cannot be a rule to us. By the language of this law? if ſo, it muſt be by the word μαθητευσατε; for there is no other limiting term in the text. But, if underſtood of making diſciples *by baptiſm*, it is intirely deprived of its limiting force, in regard to the ſubjects of that inſtitution. It muſt, therefore, contain a requiſition *to teach*—in a real and proper ſenſe, *to teach*. Here you have a limitation, and its implicit language is; "Thus far ſhall ye go, in adminiſtering baptiſm, and no further." Whence it follows, that none but thoſe who are *taught*, ſhould be baptized. Theſe, for an obvious reaſon, cannot be infants. They, therefore, muſt be conſidered, as *excepted* in this commiſſion and law of adminiſtration. But, if excepted, it cannot be a righteous, nor yet a reaſonable ſervice, to baptize them. For, as a learned Pædobaptiſt,

tiſt, well verſed in the principles of univerſal law, has obſerved; "Duty, means an action conformable to *law*; it is plain [therefore] that duty cannot be conceived without a law; that he does not perform a duty, who impoſes on himſelf what no law commands; that an action ceaſes to be duty, when the law, or the reaſon of the law, ceaſes; and that when a law extends to *certain perſons only*, of two perſons who do the ſame action, the one *performs* his duty, and the other acts *contrary* to his duty *." The pertinency and force of this reaſoning, induced me to lay it before the Reader a ſecond time.

The following remark of that well known author Mr. CHAMBERS, when ſpeaking of the German Baptiſts, deſerves regard. "What they chiefly ſupported their great doctrine on was, thoſe words of our Saviour; *He that believes, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*, Mark xvi. 16. As none but adults are capable of *believing*, they argued, that no others are capable of *baptiſm*; eſpecially as there is *no paſſage*, in all the New Teſtament, where the baptiſm of infants is clearly enjoined. CALVIN and other writers againſt them, are *pretty much embarraſſed* to anſwer this argument; and *are obliged* to have recourſe to *tradition* and the *practice of the primitive church* †." In a word; As there is no doubt but the Apoſtles knew the mind of Chriſt in this commiſſion, ſo we may be aſſured they practiſed accordingly. And as their practice, in regard to baptiſm, was a comment on this command; ſo their infallible writings muſt be conſidered as a faithful repreſentation of that practice. As therefore this divine law ſays nothing of Infant baptiſm, and as the records of Apoſtolic practice

* HEINECCIUS's *Syſtem of Univerſal Law*, B. I. Chap. V. § 121. † *Cyclopædia*; Article, ANABAPTISTS.

practice are equally ſilent about it; we are warranted to conclude, that Pædobaptiſm was neither commanded by our Lord, nor practiſed by his Apoſtles.

§ II. GEN. xvii. 7. *And I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations, for an everlaſting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee.*

DR. TWISSE: "We think that the Apoſtle's argument, Rom. ix. 8. to prove that the covenant of God with Abraham, did not include all his poſterity, is to be conſidered thus. Eſau and Jacob were of Abraham's poſterity; but God did not comprehend them both in his covenant with Abraham. All the poſterity of Abraham, therefore, are not included in it. And it is proved, that God did not include them both in the covenant of grace, becauſe Eſau, the elder, was not comprehended in it, but Jacob, the younger." *Vind. Grat.* L. I. Pars III. Digreſs. 2. in Mr. TOMBES's *Examen*. p. 49.

2. ESTIUS: "From this paſſage CALVIN infers, that becauſe a perſon is the *ſeed* of Abraham, the promiſe which was made to Abraham belongs to him. But the anſwer is plain: for that promiſe being underſtood of *ſpiritual* bleſſings, does not belong to the *carnal*, but *ſpiritual* ſeed of Abraham, even as the Apoſtle himſelf interprets it, Rom. iv. and ix. For if you underſtand the *carnal* ſeed, that promiſe will not belong to any of the Gentiles; but only to thoſe perſons that are begotten of Abraham and Iſaac,

Iſaac, according to the fleſh," *Annotat.* ad Gen. xvii. 7. in Mr. TOMBES's *Examen.* p. 50.

3. PARÆUS: "John the Baptiſt teaches, that the promiſes of God are not tied to *carnal deſcent*; but pertain only to a *believing* and *ſpiritual* poſterity. For they are not the children of Abraham, who are of Abraham according to the fleſh, but according to the ſpirit." *Comment.* in Mat. iii. 9. in Mr. TOMBES's *Examen.* p. 50.

4. Dr. AMES: "There are many of the ſeed of Abraham, to whom the word of promiſe does not belong; as Iſhmael, and the Iſhmaelites; but if there are many of Abraham's ſeed to whom the word of promiſe does not relate, the rejection of many Jews, who are of Abraham's ſeed, does not render the word of promiſe void." In Mr. TOMBES's *Examen.* p. 50.

5. ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES: "Not all they who are carnally born of Abraham, by the courſe of nature, are the children of God, to whom the promiſe of grace was made; but the children of *promiſe*, that is, thoſe who were born by virtue of the *promiſe*, thoſe who by God's *ſpecial grace* were adopted (as Iſaac by a ſpecial and ſingular promiſe was begot by Abraham) *they only* are accounted for that ſeed mentioned in the covenant; *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed.*" *Annotations* on Rom. ix. 8.

6. Mr. HENRY: "It doth not follow, that becauſe they are the ſeed of Abraham, therefore they muſt needs be the children of God; though they themſelves fancied ſo, boaſted much of, and built much upon their relation to Abraham, Mat. iii. 9. Joh. viii. 33. 39. But it doth not follow. Grace doth not run in a blood; nor are ſaving benefits inſeparably annexed to external church privileges: *though it is common for people thus*

to

to ſtretch the meaning of God's promiſe, to bolſter themſelves up in a vain hope." *Expoſition*, on Rom. ix. 6, 7.

7. WOLFIUS: "*Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of Abraham.* The Apoſtle here, in a diſtinguiſhing manner, calls the Jews *the ſeed of Abraham:* not only becauſe they ſprang from his ſeed, but alſo had nothing from him, as generating, except a corrupt nature; becauſe there is nothing ſpiritual and holy in ſeed, but it is mere nature. Hence the Jews could not derive the privileges of grace from that natural deſcent; ſeeing they were not Abraham's ſpirit, but only his *ſeed*, infected with the ſpot of ſin, or the children of the fleſh." *Curæ*, ad Rom. ix. 7.

8. GERHARDUS: "The ſeed of Abraham is twofold, carnal and ſpiritual: the promiſe alſo contains two kinds of benefits, corporal and ſpiritual." Apud FRANC. FABRICIUM, *Chriſtologia*, Diſſert. X. § 4.—See alſo LUTHER's *Comment.* on Gal. iii. 7. Mr. PERKINS's *Works*, Vol. II. p. 242. and VITRINGA, § IX. No. 7. of this Chapter.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. In that capital text, which is the ſubject of the preceding Section, baptiſm is both plainly mentioned and ſolemnly appointed; but it ſays not a word concerning infants: in this, however, to which our Brethren often appeal, that inſtitution is neither expreſſed, nor ſo much as thought of, by the inſpired Writer. A manifeſt indication, that the hiſtory of our Lord's miniſtry and the writings of his Apoſtles, contain but very little in favour of Infant baptiſm; or elſe our opponents would never ſeek a warrant for it in the time of Abraham and in the records of Moſes. A very ſingular procedure this, in regard

regard to a poſitive inſtitution of the New Teſtament! As if Jehovah had appointed Infant baptiſm along with circumciſion!—When Roman Catholics loudly appeal to Deut. xvii. 11, 12.*, in ſupport of their favourite infallibility, what do Proteſtants think of their conduct? Are they not ready to ſay, "If the votaries of Papal power were not painfully conſcious there is no evidence for them in the New Teſtament, they would never have recourſe to the Pentateuch for proof?" Why, then, may not we conclude, that our Pædobaptiſt Brethren would never produce any paſſages from the Old Teſtament, in favour of Infant baptiſm, were they not keenly ſenſible, that the apoſtolic Writings do not furniſh them with ſolid argument in its defence? But, as Dr. WATTS obſerves, "Through the influence which our own ſchemes or hypotheſes have upon the mind, we ſometimes become ſo ſharp-ſighted as to find theſe ſchemes in thoſe places of Scripture, where the holy Writers never thought of them, nor the Holy Spirit intended them *." Did Jehu ſay, once and again, in anſwer to the ſame queſtion, *What haſt thou to do with peace?* ſo we may ſay, to this and ſome other texts, when produced againſt us; "We acknowledge your inſpiration, and revere your divine authority; but what have you to do with *baptiſm?*"—Let us reflect a little, however, on the paſſage that is before us.

Now it appears, by theſe quotations from eminent Pædobaptiſts, that the covenant of God with Abraham, was not ſuch as many of our oppoſers repreſent it; that it aſcertained no ſpiritual bleſſing to his carnal ſeed, *as* ſuch; nor, conſidered merely as his

* See Mr. POOLE's *Nullity of Romiſh faith*, p. 26.

† *Logick*, Part II. Chap. III. Sect. 3.

his natural deſcendants, were any promiſes made to them of a *ſpiritual* nature. But, which is of more weight than the teſtimony of a thouſand critics and commentators, the Apoſtle Paul has placed this matter in ſo clear and ſtrong a light, as to ſuperſede all reaſon of doubt. See Rom. iv. 11, 12, 13. and ix 6, 7, 8. Gal. iii. 7. 9. 29. If, then, the natural poſterity of that illuſtrious patriarch, were not, *as* ſuch, intereſted in the Covenant of Grace by virtue of that promiſe, *I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed*; it muſt be vain and preſumptuous for Chriſtian parents to imagine, that *their* children, as ſuch, are included in the covenant, on account of the ſame promiſe. See Rom. ix. 6—12. Beſides, the words under our notice, when expounded by Paul as relating to ſpiritual bleſſings, are conſidered as belonging to the ſeed of Abraham, not as a *natural* parent, but as the father of *all believers*, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Rom. iv. 11—18. Gal. iii. 7. 16. 29.

REFLECT. II. This diſtinction, between the *natural* and *ſpiritual* ſeed of Abraham, the *promiſes* made, and the *bleſſings* aſſigned to each, ſo juſtly remarked by theſe commentators, and ſo ſtrongly confirmed by the Apoſtle; is, nevertheleſs, but little regarded by our oppoſers, when vindicating the ſuppoſed right of infants to baptiſm. I will give the Reader a ſpecimen of their language and ſentiments, relating to this affair. Mr. HENRY, for inſtance, when ſpeaking to Chriſtian parents, has the following words. "What title your children have to the ordinance [of baptiſm,] they have BY DESCENT *from you**." Mr. MORRICE expreſſes himſelf thus: "In the Scripture we ſee, that the children of the godly are to be conſidered in *the ſame* covenant promiſes of grace with their

* *Treatiſe on Baptiſm*, p. 223.

parents; that they are the Lord's children in a *diſtinguiſhing manner* from the world; they are *his heritage**". Mr. ADDINGTON aſſerts, That " the promiſes to Abraham in the Old Teſtament, and thoſe to Chriſtians in the New, appear to engage for THE SAME *ſpiritual*, TEMPORAL and *eternal* bleſſings:" and that " they are made alike to believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, and to THEIR CHILDREN, in both Teſtaments †." Mr. RUTHERFORD ſays, " The children of Papiſts and excommunicate Proteſtants, which are born within our viſible church, are baptized, if their *forefathers* have been found in the faith ‡." Mr. BLAKE, thus; " I ſhall conclude in the words of RIVET. If a parent wants true faith, yet makes profeſſion of it, and in the external ſociety of the church is accounted a believer, or hath been accounted heretofore under the Old Teſtament; the infants born of ſuch parents are in covenant with them, and partakers of the promiſe, even upon *this account:* becauſe the promiſe was received of the anceſtors *in behalf of the poſterity* that ſhould iſſue from them; which the unbelief or hypocriſy of the immediate parent, cannot make invalid, as long as the infant cannot imitate the unbelief or hypocriſy of the parent §." Mr. RATHBAND aſſures us, that " children may be lawfully accounted within God's covenant, if *any* of their anceſtors, in *any* generation, were faithful, Exod. xx. 5 ||." And CUNÆUS expreſſes himſelf to the following effect: " Though the bulk of Abraham's poſterity had no knowledge or

* *Social Relig.* Dialogue VIII. † *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſons*, p. 100. ‡ *Due Right of Preſbytery*, p. 259. in Mr. TOMBES's *Examen.* p. 55. § *Vindiciæ Fœderis*, Chap. XLVII. Sect. III. p. 446, 447. || In Mr. TOMBES's *Examen.* p. 32.

or perception of the Meſſiah, yet celeſtial bleſſedneſs might be given to them for the ſake of the patriarchs, who had an intellectual view of the Meſſiah, and received from the Deity this promiſe of the covenant, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed after thee* *."

Here one can hardly forbear obſerving, what a gradual and great advance there is, on the idea of *covenant intereſt*, in virtue of *carnal deſcent* from believing parents—a wonderful advance, in reſpect of privilege, of honour, and of ſafety. According to Mr. HENRY, the infants of Chriſtian parents are intitled to baptiſm by *patrimonial* right—a right really *inheritable*, as an earthly eſtate. Mr. MORRICE, however, is not contented with providing for them a title to baptiſm, nor with allowing them a ſhare in an external covenant: no, he boldly pronounces them intereſted in "*the ſame covenant promiſes of grace* with their parents." Yet even this, in the eſtimate of Mr. ADDINGTON, is too ſmall a privilege. For he aſſures us, that THE SAME *promiſes* which were made to Abraham, are made to Chriſtians and THEIR CHILDREN; which promiſes "appear to engage for *the ſame ſpiritual*, TEMPORAL *and eternal bleſſings*." So that if Abraham was aſſured, by divine promiſe, of having *a numerous offspring*, and of his poſterity enjoying *the land of Canaan*; every believing parent may be aſcertained of the ſame temporal benefits, in reſpect of his poſterity. If that illuſtrious patriarch had *ſpiritual and eternal bleſſings* inſured to him; every Chriſtian parent has an equal ſecurity, both in regard to himſelf and his children. Thus every believing father becomes an ABRAHAM to his offspring!—But, perhaps, you may ſay; "All this, though admirable, is

* Apud F. FABRICIUM, *Chriſtologia*, Diſſert. X. § 5.

is to be underſtood concerning the *immediate* offſpring of pious parents; and what, then, muſt become of thoſe infants whoſe fathers and mothers are, either hypocritical profeſſors of religion, or profligate and profane?" Well, I would not have you deſpond concerning theſe; for the doctrine of *carnal deſcent* may ſolve, peradventure, the gloomy query. Do but obſerve what the famous RUTHERFORD ſays, and you muſt ſee, that the children of Papiſts and of excommunicated Proteſtants are intitled to *baptiſm*; provided they had but the happineſs of being born in a *certain diſtrict*, and of having *forefathers* that were ſound in the faith. Should you ſuſpect, that this is not quite ſo determinate as might be wiſhed, caſt your eye on the words of Meſſrs. BLAKE and RIVET. They unite in aſſerting, that the divine promiſe was received by the anceſtors, *on the* BEHALF *of their poſterity*. And, ſhould a diſtruſtful thought ariſe in your mind, about the probability of ſome infants being ſo very unhappy, as to have deſcended from anceſtors that have been ungodly for *many generations*; yet I would not have you conſider even *theſe* children as left to the uncovenanted mercies of God. For this admirable doctrine of *carnal deſcent*, in the ſkilful hand of Mr. RATHBAND, provides perfect relief in the pinching caſe. Yes, he aſſures us, that if ANY *of theſe children's anceſtors, in* ANY *generation*, were believers; the poor infants "may be lawfully accounted *in the covenant*." You ſee, then, that if the children, in your ſuppoſition, were ſo uncommonly unhappy, as to have had no pious anceſtor in the long liſt of Noah's deſcendents; yet, as they have an undoubted claim of kindred to that father of the new world, they are to be conſidered as in the covenant. Nay, were you to entertain a better opinion of Adam's piety,

piety, than of Noah's; you are perfectly at liberty to improve their deſcent from him, for the ſame end. For, according to an intimation given by Mr. RATHBAND, the friendly force of carnal deſcent from godly anceſtors, is not quite exhauſted in leſs than *a thouſand generations*; one third of which has not yet elapſed, ſince the beginning of the world.—Then comes CUNÆUS, who crowns the whole, by obviating another gloomy doubt, which may, poſſibly, ariſe in your mind. You are, perhaps, ready to ſay; "But, ſuppoſing the favoured infants, thus indulged with a federal intereſt, ſhould live to maturity, grow up in ignorance of Jeſus Chriſt, and leave the world in an unconverted ſtate; then, ah! then what muſt become of them?" Become of them! why, ſays this learned foreigner, They may be ſaved for the ſake of their *pious*, though remote, *progenitors*; who received from Jehovah the cheering promiſe, *I will be thy God, and the God of* THY SEED AFTER THEE. And though F. FABRICIUS was unpolite enough to cenſure this doctrine, as *Judaiſm*; nay, though CALOVIUS, in a fit of the ſpleen, we ſuppoſe, condemned it as *atheiſtical*; yet, you know, it is admirably well calculated to foſter an expectation of eternal felicity in the minds of ungodly perſons. There being juſt ground of apprehenſion, that many around us would hardly have charity enough to think themſelves Chriſtians, or any reaſon to conſider themſelves as in a fair way for heaven, were it not for theſe two happy expedients, *anceſtorial piety* and *Infant baptiſm*; CUNÆUS and others have kindly provided an opiate for conſcience, that ſuch perſons may ſleep at their eaſe and pleaſingly dream of doing well at the laſt.

In oppoſition, however, to ſuch authors as talk at

at this marvellous rate, I will preſent my Reader with language and ſentiments of a different complexion, from two or three Pædobaptiſts, and one Baptiſt. The firſt of theſe is VENEMA, who ſpeaks to the following purpoſe. "Celeſtial prerogatives cannot be tranſmitted *from parents to children*; nor can that idea be rendered conſiſtent, either with the œconomy of grace, or the juſtice of God—No one is ſanctified by the Lord, for the ſake of another man: not infants, in virtue of their deſcent from believers; for this the Scripture no where affirms, nor is it conſiſtent with reaſon*." The next is Abp. LEIGHTON, who ſays; "That it is the parent's faith gives the child a right to it [baptiſm,] is neither clear from Scripture, nor any ſound reaſon†."—To conſtitute a triumvirate, I will add that eminent author Dr. OWEN, who expreſſes his mind thus: "Two privileges did God grant unto Abraham, upon his ſeparation to a ſpecial intereſt in the old promiſe and covenant. Firſt, that, according to the fleſh, he ſhould be *the father* of the Meſſiah; the promiſed ſeed, who was the very life of the covenant, the fountain and cauſe of all the bleſſings contained in it. That this privilege was *temporary*,—the thing itſelf doth demonſtrate—— Secondly; Together with this, he had alſo another privilege granted unto him; namely, that his faith, whereby he was perſonally intereſted in the covenant, ſhould be the *pattern* of the faith of the church in all generations; and that none ſhould ever come to be *a member* of it, or *a ſharer* in its bleſſings, but by the ſame faith that he had fixed on the *Seed* that was in the promiſe, to be brought forth from him in the world. On the account of this privilege, he became the

* *Diſſert. Sac.* L. III. C. I. § 11.
† *Select Works*, Lett. I. p. 548.

the father of all them that do believe. For they that are of the faith, the ſame are the children of Abraham, Gal. iii. 7. Rom. iv. 11. as alſo heirs of the world, Rom. iv. 13. in that all that ſhould believe throughout the world, being *thereby* implanted into the covenant made with him, ſhould become his *ſpiritual children*. Anſwerable unto this twofold end of the ſeparation of Abraham, there was a *double ſeed* allotted unto him. A ſeed according to the *fleſh*, ſeparated to the bringing forth of the Meſſiah, according to the fleſh; and a ſeed according to *the promiſe*, that is, ſuch as *by faith* ſhould have intereſt in the promiſe, or all the elect of God—Multitudes, afterwards, were of the carnal ſeed of Abraham, and of the number of the people, ſeparated to bring forth the Meſſiah in the fleſh; and yet were not of the ſeed according to the promiſe, nor intereſted in the *ſpiritual* bleſſings of the covenant, becauſe they did not perſonally believe, as our Apoſtle declares, Heb. iv. And many, afterwards, who were not of the *carnal* ſeed of Abraham, nor intereſted in the privilege of bringing forth the Meſſiah in the fleſh; were yet deſigned to be made his ſpiritual ſeed by faith, that in them he might become *heir of the world*, and all nations of the earth be bleſſed in him. Now it is evident, that it is the *ſecond* privilege and *ſpiritual* ſeed, wherein the church, to whom the promiſes are made, is founded, and whereof it doth conſiſt; namely, in them, who *by faith* are intereſted in the covenant of Abraham, whether they be of the carnal ſeed or no. And herein lay the great miſtake of the Jews of old, wherein they are followed by their poſterity unto this day. *They thought no more was needful to intereſt them in the covenant of Abraham, but that they were* HIS SEED *according to the fleſh: and they conſtantly pleaded the* LATTER *privilege, as the ground*

and

and reaſon of the FORMER. It is true, they were the children of Abraham, according to the fleſh; but, on that account, they *can have no other privilege* than Abraham had in the fleſh himſelf: and this was, as we have ſhewed, that he ſhould be ſet apart as a ſpecial channel, through whoſe loins God would derive the promiſed Seed into the world——The former carnal privilege of Abraham and his poſterity expiring on the grounds before mentioned, the *ordinances of worſhip*, which were ſuited thereunto, did neceſſarily ceaſe alſo. And this caſt the Jews into great perplexities, and proved the laſt trial that God made of them. For whereas both theſe, namely the carnal and ſpiritual privileges of Abraham's covenant, had been carried on together in a mixed way for many generations, coming now to be ſeparated, and a trial to be made who of the Jews had intereſt in both, who in one only; thoſe who had only the carnal privilege of being children of Abraham *according to the fleſh*, contended for a ſhare *on that ſingle account* in the other alſo; that is, in *all the promiſes* annexed to the covenant. But the foundation of their plea was taken away, and the church, unto which the promiſes belong, remained with them that were heirs of Abraham's *faith* only——The church unto whom all the promiſes belong, are *only* thoſe who are heirs of Abraham's faith; *believing* as he did, and *thereby intereſted in his covenant**." Thus far the Doctor: and were it not evident beyond a doubt, that he approved Infant baptiſm, I ſhould certainly have conſidered him here, as *intending* to oppoſe it. For, to render his reaſoning conſiſtent with various arguments commonly adduced in favour of that hypotheſis, no ſmall ſhare of critical

* *Exercitat. on Epiſt. to Heb.* Exercit. VI. Vol. I. p. 55, 56, 57.

critical legerdemain is required.—I will now produce the words of an illuſtrious *Baptiſt*—yes, of a BAPTIST, whoſe judgment in this caſe is of more worth than that of all the Doctors, Profeſſors, and Archbiſhops in Europe. The venerable Son of Zacharias, obſerving many of the Jews coming to his baptiſm, and well knowing their plea of intereſt in Abraham's covenant, by virtue of carnal deſcent, with great ſolemnity ſaid; *O generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth fruits meet for repentance. And think not to ſay within yourſelves,* WE HAVE ABRAHAM TO OUR FATHER, *for I ſay unto you, that God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children unto Abraham.* Mat. iii. 7, 8, 9. A caveat, this, againſt every ſimilar plea, reſpecting a poſitive inſtitution of the New Teſtament, to the end of time.

§ III. EZEKIEL xvi. 20, 21. *Thou haſt taken thy Sons and thy Daughters, whom thou haſt born unto me—Thou haſt ſlain my Children.*

CALVIN: "*Thou*, ſaith God, *haſt ſlain thy ſons and thy daughters:* but they were alſo *mine*; for thou haſt begotten them to me. Here God puts himſelf in the place of a father, becauſe he had adopted that people to himſelf. The body of the people, therefore, was, as it were, a *ſpouſe*, or *wife*. Whoever thence aroſe, were *ſons*; becauſe, if the covenant of God with the people was a *marriage contract*, thoſe who drew their origin from that people ought to be reckoned among *his children*. God, therefore, aſſerts that they were *his ſons* who were ſo ſlain: like as if a huſband ſhould object to

his wife, that the children, common to them both, were forced away for her own pleaſure." *In loc.*

2. Dr. ERSKINE: "The Sinai covenant was made, not only with thoſe who came out of Egypt, but with all ſucceeding generations that were to ſpring from them. Deſcent from Iſrael gave any one a right to the benefits of this covenant; for which reaſon the children even of unregenerate Iſraelites, were circumciſed the eighth day, and were ſaid to be *born unto God*, Ezek. xvi. 20." *Theolog. Diſſertat.* p. 8.

3. ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES: "*Whom thou:* who at their birth were mine, by virtue of my covenant, whereby the *whole body* of the nation was a wife to me, and the particular perſons as children; wherefore thou ſhouldſt have conſecrated them to me." *Note*, on the place.

REFLECTION.

Hence it appears quite futile to plead this paſſage as a proof, that the infants of Chriſtian parents are intereſted in the covenant of grace, and that they are the *Lord's children*, in a peculiar ſenſe. Becauſe, as the judicious and learned VENEMA juſtly obſerves; The Sinai covenant, in this Chapter, is plainly repreſented under the idea of an *external conjugal contract*. For though, in Verſe the eighth, it is expreſſly called a covenant; yet it is *manifeſtly diſtinguiſhed* from the everlaſting covenant of grace, Verſe 60, 61, 62. which further appears, from its being made with *the whole people*. The *beauty* of Iſrael was alſo an external thing; ſeeing they placed their *confidence* in it, and committed whoredom becauſe of it. See Verſe 15. And, having apoſtatized from God, to deteſtable idolatry, they not only

only communicated of their good things and ornaments, beſtowed upon them by the Lord, to Pagan idols; but they alſo ſacrificed their children, that are called, *Jehovah's children*, to idols*. With reference to the ſame covenant between God and Iſrael, the country poſſeſſed by the choſen tribes is called *Immanuel's land*, and the *Lord's land*, Iſa. viii. 8. Hoſ. ix. 3. To infer, therefore, from this paſſage, as Mr. HENRY does in his Note on the place, that "the children of [Chriſtian] parents that are members of the viſible church, are to be looked upon as *born unto God*, and *his children*;" is to place us under the *Sinai* covenant—is to *confound* the Old, with the New OEconomy. Conſequently, every argument formed on this, or any ſimilar text, in order to prove the right of infants to baptiſm; only betrays, either the weakneſs of the diſputant, or the want of ſubſtantial evidence—*that* evidence, which is agreeable to the nature of a *poſitive* inſtitution. It is really ſurpriſing to think, that learned, and wiſe, and godly men, ſhould ſend us to the ſeventeenth of Geneſis, and the ſixteenth of Ezekiel, to learn the mind of our Lord when he ſaid; *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them!*—to get information, who are the proper ſubjects of an ordinance, a *poſitive* ordinance, that is *peculiar* to the New Teſtament! It is not, however, quite ſo ſtrange, we freely confeſs, as to ſend us to the TALMUD for the ſame purpoſe: yet this is frequently done!

* *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. II. C. III. § 12.

§ IV. MAT. xix. 4. *Suffer the little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

MR. POOLE'S CONTINUATORS: "We muſt take heed we do not found Infant baptiſm upon the example of Chriſt in this text; for it is *certain* that he did not baptize theſe children. Mark ſays, He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and bleſſed them. The argument for Infant baptiſm, from this text, is founded upon his *words*, not upon his practice." *Annotations* on the place.

2. Dr. WHITBY: "But, ſay the Antipædobaptiſts, Chriſt neither did baptize them, [the little children] nor commanded the Apoſtles to do it. Anſw. That is not to be wondered at, if we conſider that—Chriſtian baptiſm was not yet inſtituted; and that the baptiſm then uſed by John and Chriſt's diſciples, was only the baptiſm of repentance, and faith in the Meſſiah which was for to come, Acts xix. 4. *of both which infants were incapable.*" *Annotation*, on the place.

3. Mr. BURKIT: "They [the little children] were brought unto Jeſus Chriſt: but for what end? Not *to baptize* them, but to *bleſs* them——But, ſay ſome, Chriſt did neither baptize them, nor commanded his diſciples ſo to do. Anſw. That is not to be wondered at, if we conſider, that they had already entered into covenant with God by circumciſion, and Chriſtian baptiſm was not yet inſtituted. John's baptiſm was the baptiſm of repentance, of

of which *infants were incapable.*" *Expoſ. Notes* on the place.

4. Dr. DODDRIDGE: "I acknowledge theſe words of themſelves will not prove Infant baptiſm to be an inſtitution of Chriſt; but if that appears from other Scriptures to be the caſe (which I think moſt *probable*) there will be proportionable reaſon to believe, that our Lord might here intend ſome reference to it." *Note* on the place.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It appears from theſe expoſitors, That the little children here mentioned, were *not baptized* by our Lord, nor by his Apoſtles—That it is *dangerous* to the cauſe of Pædobaptiſm, to found it on the practice of Chriſt, as here narrated—And, that infants were not baptized in *thoſe times.* Dr. DODDRIDGE, indeed, thinks it moſt *probable*, that the ſacred text in other places repreſents Infant baptiſm as an inſtitution of Chriſt; whence he infers a *proportional probability*, that our Lord intended a reference to it in theſe words: and BENGELIUS roundly aſſerts, that if the parents of theſe children had *requeſted* baptiſm for them, it would not have been denied *. But the conduct of our Lord's diſciples, in *rebuking* thoſe who brought the children, renders it far more likely, that infants were conſidered as *incapable* of the baptiſm then adminiſtered; as WHITBY and BURKIT obſerve. For, is it not ſtrange, unaccountably ſtrange, that our Lord's moſt intimate friends ſhould have been *offended* with the perſons who brought thoſe children, if it had then been cuſtomary to *baptize* infants? Such a practice could not have commenced, much leſs have been

* *Gnomon*, ad Mat. xix. 13.

been common among the followers of Jeſus Chriſt, but theſe diſciples muſt have known it; for, as *Jeſus himſelf baptized not*, they muſt have been the adminiſtrators. And, had that been the caſe; or had they known and approved the modern grounds of Pædobaptiſm, ſuch as, *the proſelyte baptiſm*, *Jewiſh circumciſion*, the *Abrahamic covenant*, and the *relative ſtate* of infants, whoſe parents are believers; there is no reaſon to imagine they would have acted as they did, in this inſtance.—Our opponents would fain perſuade us, that theſe diſciples, however, were all Pædobaptiſts: but were any of our Pædobaptiſt Brethren at this day, to have an equally favourable opportunity, with the diſciples, of ſhewing how they ſtand affected to Infant baptiſm; they muſt either act a *very different* part, or be cenſured by multitudes as quite lukewarm in the cauſe, and, perhaps, fall under the foul ſuſpicion of Antipædobaptiſm.

REFLECT. II. That it is lawful for a parent, or a miniſter, to give up infants to God by ſolemn prayer, which is a *moral* duty, we readily allow; and that the conduct of Chriſt, on this occaſion, manifeſted his regard for little children, is beyond a doubt; at the thought of which, we are ſo far from being pained, that we rejoice. Yes, it is matter of joy; becauſe, in our view, it wears a ſmiling aſpect on the *final ſtate* of ſuch as die in their infancy; and that without any reſtriction, in reference to *carnal deſcent*, which limitation has the appearance of a Jewiſh tenet. But hence to infer, that infants are intitled to baptiſm, any more than to the holy ſupper, is a concluſion wide of the mark—is making *moral* conſiderations the rule of adminiſtering *poſitive* inſtitutions; of which there is no inſtance, and for which there is no reaſon,

reaſon, in the word of God. See CHAPTER I. Beſides, how awkwardly it looks thus to argue: Chriſt expreſſed a condeſcending regard for little children *without* baptizing them, or ſaying a word about it; therefore we ſhould manifeſt an affectionate care for infants, *by* baptizing them! He who can fairly prove the point, or make any advances towards it, from ſuch premiſes, muſt be a wonderful proficient in the art of ſyllogizing.

Having juſt obſerved, that it is lawful to give up infants to God, by *ſolemn prayer*; I am reminded of what Mr. ADDINGTON calls, a *preſumptive* argument for Infant baptiſm. Thus he reaſons: "We ſeem to need ſuch a rite as this; ſince the birth of a child is an event of great importance to a family, and it muſt appear a parent's duty,—it cannot but be a *pious* parent's inclination, early to devote his children to God, through Chriſt; expreſſing his fervent deſires that they may partake, with himſelf, of the bleſſings of the Chriſtian covenant. This argument appears to receive additional ſtrength from the practice of our Baptiſt brethren, (many of them at leaſt) who, feeling the need, propriety, and uſefulneſs of ſome ſuch rite as we ſuppoſe Infant baptiſm to be, have invented one of *their own*, which nearly reſembles it, excepting in the ceremonial part *."—There are ſeveral particulars, in this quotation, on which I would take the liberty of animadverting. "We *ſeem to need* ſuch a rite" as Infant baptiſm. Very feeble, however, is the foundation of that *poſitive* rite, which reſts on what its votaries conſider as a *ſeeming neceſſity*. The antients imagined, no doubt, that ſponſors, the ſign of the croſs, Infant communion, and various other things, were *needful*. Nay, there

* *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſons, P. S. to Advertiſement.*

there is reaſon to think, that the deviſers of unſcriptural rites have generally thought their own inventions *needful*, either to adorn the worſhip of God, or to render it more edifying.—But "the birth of a child is an event of great importance to a family." This is readily granted: yet, ſurely, there are other ways of acknowledging Providence in ſuch an event, beſides that of *baptizing* the infant.—It is, we acknowledge, "a parent's duty," to give up his children to God, through Chriſt, by ſolemn prayer; and a *pious* parent will certainly expreſs "his fervent deſires that they may partake with himſelf," of all ſpiritual bleſſings. But what has this to do with the right of his infant offspring to *baptiſm?* It is no other, there is reaſon to conclude, than was practiſed by pious patriarchs before the flood. Parental conduct of this kind, is a branch of *moral* duty, and has nothing in it peculiar to the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, any more than to the patriarchal, or the Jewiſh OEconomy. Beſides, I take it for granted, that the worthy author himſelf repeatedly did all this for his children, *before* he baptized them.—But many of the Baptiſts, it ſeems, "feeling the need, propriety, and uſefulneſs of ſome ſuch rite," as Infant baptiſm, "have *invented* one of THEIR OWN, which nearly reſembles it, excepting in the *ceremonial* part." Indeed! This, to me, I confeſs, is a new diſcovery. Let us conſider, however, what that ceremony is, which we have had the honour of *inventing*, and which is emphatically called OUR OWN. It is, if I underſtand to what he refers, as follows: Being ſometimes requeſted by the parents of a new born child, to unite with them in addreſſing the Father of all mercies, we comply. On which occaſion, we frequently read ſome portion of Scripture; give a word

word of exhortation to the parents, reſpecting the education of their child; return thanks to the Giver of all good, for the recent bleſſings beſtowed on the family; and recommend the infant to God by earneſt prayer. This is all, to the beſt of my knowledge, which the generality of us either practiſe or approve, on ſuch an occaſion. And now, Reader, what is there in all this of a *poſitive* rite? What is there in it that is not of a *moral* nature, or that would not have ſuited the character of a pious Jew, before the incarnation? What is there, then, in the whole proceeding, that we have *invented*, or can juſtly be called *our own?*—Our author, notwithſtanding, inſiſts, that it bears a near reſemblance to Infant baptiſm, "excepting in the *ceremonial* part." But is not that an *eſſential* difference? We do not object againſt the conduct of our Pædobaptiſt Brethren, becauſe they *pray* with the parents; becauſe they *exhort* them to a diligent performance of parental duty; nor yet, becauſe they *give up* the child to God in ſolemn ſupplication, and ſolicit the beſt of bleſſings on its behalf; but becauſe they perform an action upon it, which is manifeſtly CEREMONIAL, and claim the *higheſt authority* for ſo doing. When, therefore, Mr. ADDINGTON repreſents us, as performing a rite that nearly reſembles Infant baptiſm, "excepting in the *ceremonial* part;" it is, in other words, only ſaying, that the two rites (if our mode of proceeding muſt be called *a rite*) nearly agree, *excepting* THE DIFFERENCE there is between them.

§ V.

§ V. JOHN iii. 5. *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

MR. CHARNOCK: "All the difficulty lies in that expreſſion, of *water*. Some, as the Papiſts, underſtand it of the elementary water of baptiſm; and from this place exclude all children, dying without baptiſm, from ſalvation——'Tis ſtrange that, when all agree that the birth here ſpoken of is *ſpiritual* and metaphorical, that the water here ſhould be *natural*. None could be ſaved, unleſs baptized, if this were meant of baptiſm. As, if theſe words, *Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, were meant of the ſupper, none could be ſaved unleſs they did partake of it—Baptiſm was not *then* inſtituted, as a ſtanding ſacrament in the Chriſtian church. The inſtitution of it we find not till after Chriſt's reſurrection, Mat. xxviii. 19. And it is not likely Chriſt would diſcourſe to Nicodemus of the neceſſity of an inſtitution that was not yet expreſſly appointed by him, and which he did not appoint till after his reſurrection. For he diſcourſeth of that which was of *preſent* neceſſity—'Tis ſtrange that our Saviour ſhould ſpeak to Nicodemus of the neceſſity of baptiſm, before he had informed him of the myſteries of the goſpel, whereof 'tis a ſeal. To ſpeak of a ſeal, before he ſpeaks of that which is ſealed by it, is not congruous. For the ſacraments being founded upon the doctrine on which they depend, to begin by a ſacrament the inſtruction of a man, is to begin a building by the tiles

tiles and rafters, before you lay a foundation; and againſt the order expreſt by our Saviour to the apoſtles, which puts *teaching* before baptizing, and was always practiſed in the primitive times, and is to this day in all Chriſtian churches, to the adult and grown up—Thoſe that underſtand it of the baptiſmal water, and ſo make that of abſolute neceſſity, do by another aſſertion accuſe their own expoſition of falſity. For they ſay, that the baptiſm of *blood* ſupplies the want of water—which cannot be, if the baptiſm of water were to be underſtood in this place, and ſo abſolutely neceſſary. 'Tis *water* that is expreſt, and *blood* is not water. A *martyr*, dying unbaptized, muſt be damned, and cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, if this place be meant of the water of baptiſm. It may alſo be obſerved, that Chriſt in the progreſs of his diſcourſe, makes no more mention of *water*, but of the *Spirit* (*that which is born of the Spirit, is ſpirit:*) not born of *water* and the Spirit, which had been very neceſſary, if water had been of an equal neceſſity with the Spirit to the new birth. And ſince Chriſt mentions it poſitively, that *he that is born of the Spirit, is ſpirit*; will it be ſaid, That if any be born of the *Spirit*, without water, he is ſtill but *fleſh?* Water, then, is to be taken myſtically—By *water* and the *Spirit*, are ſignified one and the ſame thing; the ſimilitude of water, ſhewing the cleanſing and regenerating virtue of the Spirit; as *fire*, and the *Spirit*, are put together, to ſignify the refining quality the Spirit hath, as fire hath to ſeparate the droſs from the good metal. Fire, and the Spirit, i. e. a ſpirit of fire, of the force and efficacy of fire." *Works*, Vol. II. p. 3, 4. Edit. 2d.

2. WITSIUS: "*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*—By

By *water*, the Holy Spirit, with his operations, ſeems to be underſtood.—The *common* interpretation is to be preferred; which is, that, by *water* and the *Spirit*, one and the ſame thing is meant; as, by the *Spirit*, and *fire*, Mat. iii. 11. For nothing is more common, in the ſacred Scriptures, than for the Holy Spirit to be repreſented under the emblem of water. See, among other paſſages, Iſa. xliv. 3." *OEcon. Foed.* L. III. C. VI. § 24.

3. COCCEIUS: "*Except a man be regenerated of water and of the Spirit:* that is, by the imputation of the merit of Chriſt, and the power of the Holy Spirit." *Summa Doct. de Fæd.* Cap. XII. § 352.

4. HEIDEGGERUS: "By the term *water*, our Lord here does not underſtand baptiſm, becauſe that is not the cauſe of regeneration;—becauſe it is not impoſſible, that a perſon may be regenerated and enter the kingdom of God, without baptiſm; and becauſe, at the time when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, a teacher of Iſrael, ſuch an one as Nicodemus was, might eaſily be ignorant of it without ſuch a fault, as Chriſt reproves in Nicodemus, Verſe 10." *Corpus Theolog.* Tom. II. p. 231.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. By theſe quotations, to which a great number of others might have been added, we learn, that baptiſm is not intended by the term *water*, in this paſſage: becauſe, The birth, concerning which our Lord ſpeaks, is of a *ſpiritual* nature, and therefore the word *water* muſt not be underſtood in a *literal* ſenſe. See No. 1.—Becauſe, were baptiſm here deſigned, none could be *ſaved* without it, any more than without the ſanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit.

Spirit. See No. 1. 4.—Becauſe baptiſm is not the *cauſe* of regeneration. See No. 4.—Becauſe it is not to be ſuppoſed, that our Lord would ſpeak to Nicodemus about baptiſm, *before* he was taught the myſteries of the goſpel. See No. 1.—Becauſe thoſe who underſtand the term *water* in a literal ſenſe, are obliged, in certain caſes, to depart from that interpretation. *Ibid.*—Becauſe Chriſt, in the following Verſes, mentions being born of the *Spirit*, without ſaying any more of *water*. *Ibid.*—Becauſe, had baptiſm been deſigned, there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe our Lord would have reproved Nicodemus as he did, for his ignorance of it. See No. 4.—And, therefore, that the term *water*, muſt be underſtood in a *myſtical* ſenſe, as expreſſing the ſanctifying agency of the Holy Spirit, in regeneration. See No. 1, 2. Such is the opinion of theſe learned authors, concerning the remarkable text before us.

REFLECT. II. Though it appears, by quotations from Pædobaptiſts, in CHAP. X. and XII. that a falſe interpretation of this paſſage had much the ſame influence on the conduct of many, in the latter part of the third Century, and in following ages, with regard to Infant *baptiſm*; as a ſimilar miſunderſtanding of Joh. vi. 53. had, in reſpect of Infant *communion*; and though the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, and the Church of England *, avow that ſenſe of the text which is here oppoſed; yet this oppoſition being grounded on ſuch reaſons as appear concluſive, I need not here enlarge; eſpecially, as I have touched upon it, in CHAP. X. REFLECT. II.—It may not be amiſs to obſerve, however, that a miſtake about the meaning of theſe words, produced the opinion of baptiſm being neceſſary to *ſalvation:* which falſe notion proved the

* *Office for Public Baptiſm of Infants.*

the fruitful parent of ſeveral ſtrange practices, in both ancient and modern times. What, for inſtance, but ſuch a miſtake, or ſomething like it, could have induced any to baptize the *dead?* a practice, which was forbidden by the third Council of Carthage, in the concluſion of the fourth Century *; which Council, in the ſame canon, alſo forbade the adminiſtration of the holy ſupper to any defunct. What elſe was the reaſon of *midwives* being warranted, by eccleſiaſtical authority, to baptize infants as ſoon as ever they emerged into light, if a ſpeedy diſſolution was threatened? Concerning which DEYLINGIUS, a learned modern Lutheran, ſays; "In caſe of neceſſity, laics, yea, and *women*, rightly appointed for the buſineſs, *midwives*, and *mothers* themſelves, may baptize †." Nay, what elſe occaſions a kind of *half* baptiſm to be ſo frequently practiſed in the Church of England? The laſt of theſe particulars has been ſeverely cenſured, by ſome Pædobaptiſts themſelves. Dr. WISHART, for example, when animadverting upon it, ſays: "Is a new born child *weak?* Does *mercy* (ever to be preferred to ſacrifice) forbid bringing it to the public? Why, *then* a miniſter muſt be got, in all haſte, to perform a certain ceremony upon it, which they call *chriſtening* it: what it *means*, they know not: but the thing *muſt* be done, not for the inſtruction of the parents, but to ſave the infant from *hell!* and what a cruel man muſt he be, who will grudge his travel for *ſuch* a purpoſe, when a few words of his mouth and motions of his hands will do the buſineſs? Strange, that ever men, under the advantages of the light of the goſpel, ſhould have ſunk into ſuch notions of God and religion!

* CARANZÆ *Sum. Concil.* p. 92, 93.

† *De Paſtoral. Prudentia*, Pars III. Cap. III. § 4.

gion *!—Another author has expreſſed himſelf in the following ſarcaſtical manner:

"A child is born—'tis born to die:
Make haſte—perhaps its end is *nigh:*
Here comes the curate—well!
The hov'ring goſſips round him ſtand,
When with his high-commiſſioned hand,
He ſaves, *one half*, from hell †."

§ VI. Acts ii. 39. *The Promiſe is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.*

Dr. Owen: "This promiſe of the Spirit—is ſometimes called, the promiſe of the covenant, Acts ii. 39. *The promiſe is to you:* which promiſe is that which Chriſt receiveth from his Father, Verſe 33. even the promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt.*" *Doct. of Saints Perſeverance*, p. 116.

2. Witsius: "*And it ſhall come to paſs afterwards, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all fleſh*, Joel ii. 28. Concerning *which promiſe* Peter ſpeaks, Acts ii. 39. *For the promiſe is unto you, and to your children.*" *Exercit. in Symb.* Exercit. XI. § 19.

3. Mr. Gataker: "To the obtaining the promiſe, as well *repentance*, as partaking of baptiſm, at leaſt in this place, is exacted; ſo that hence the promiſe of remiſſion of ſin cannot be proved to be made to infants, when they are entered by baptiſm, unleſs alſo *they repent.*" *Diſcept. de Bap. Infant.* p. 12. in Mr. Tombes's *Antipædobap.* Part III. p. 17.

4. Dr.

* *Eſſay on the Neceſſ. of a Good Life*, p. 99, 100.
† *The Mitre*, p. 218.

4. Dr. DODDRIDGE: "Conſidering that *the gift of the Spirit* had been mentioned juſt before, it ſeems moſt natural to interpret *this*, as a reference to that paſſage in Joel which had been ſo largely cited above, (Verſe 17. *et ſeq.*) where God promiſes the effuſion of the Spirit on his ſons and daughters: And accordingly I have paraphraſed the latter clauſe of this Verſe, as referring to its *extraordinary gifts*; and the rather, as the ſanctifying influences of the Spirit muſt already have been received, to prepare them for entering into the church by baptiſm." *Note*, on the place.

5. Dr. HAMMOND: "If any have made uſe of that *very unconcludent* argument, [from Acts ii. 39.] I have nothing to ſay in defence of them. I think that the practice is founded on a better baſis than ſo; and that the word *children* there, is really the *poſterity* of the Jews, and not peculiarly their infant children." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 490.

6. Dr. WHITBY: "Theſe words will not prove a right of infants to receive baptiſm. The promiſe here being that only of *the Holy Ghoſt*, mentioned Verſe 16, 17, 18. and ſo relating only to the times of the miraculous effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt, and to thoſe perſons who by age were made capable of theſe extraordinary gifts." *Annotations*, on the place.

7. LIMBORCH: "By τεκνα, the Apoſtle underſtands, not *infants*, but *children*, or *poſterity*; in which ſignification the word τεκνα occurs, in many places of the New Teſtament: ſee, among others, Joh. viii. 39. And here Peter alſo comprehends, in that expreſſion, their unborn poſterity—Whence it appears, that the argument which is very commonly taken from this paſſage for the baptiſm of infants, is of *no force*, and *good for nothing*; becauſe it intirely departs

departs from the design of Peter. It is necessary therefore, that Pædobaptism should be supported by other arguments." *Comment.* in loc.

8. VENEMA: "*The promise is unto you and to your children.* The common opinion of interpreters is, that children destitute of reason are here intended: and hence it is inferred, that the promises of grace are equally made to them, as to their parents; seeing the covenant of God is said to be made with Abraham and *his seed.* If this interpretation be true, no doubt can remain concerning the infants of believers being in a relative state of grace; but I fear, that, more accurately examined, it cannot be defended. For the *promise* manifestly pertains, not to the blessings of grace and salvation; but to the *extraordinary gift* of the Holy Spirit, just before poured out upon the Apostles, which is mentioned Verse 38, and to which infants have no special right. Nor is there any doubt, but the Apostle had in his eye Joel ii. both because he had just cited that prophecy, Verse 17. and because he takes the last words of our text from Joel ii. 32. *Sons*, therefore, as in Joel, are here the citizens of Jerusalem; *young men*, such as the Apostles themselves were, and as many as should believe in Christ. *To you*, he says, *and to your sons*; to the old and the young; to parents and children; to Jerusalem and its inhabitants, is made the promise of *pouring out the Spirit*; wherefore, it is your special privilege to receive Christ, and to be planted in him by baptism; that so you may be rendered the actual partakers of the promise, which is not to be obtained without that condition. Interpreters, perhaps, might not have been averse to this view of the text, if they had clearly seen that the words of Peter are taken intirely from the prophecy of Joel." *Dissertat. Sac.* L. III. C. IV. § 7. 8.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. We are taught, by theſe quotations, That the promiſe intended is the *Holy Spirit*, and his *extraordinary gifts*. See No 1, 2. 4. 6. 8.—That the term *children*, ſignifies *poſterity*. See No 5. 7, 8.—That *repentance* and a *reception of Chriſt*, are neceſſary to an enjoyment of the bleſſings promiſed. See No 3. 8.—And, that the argument formed on this paſſage, in defence of Infant baptiſm, is *very inconcluſive*, of *no force*, and *good for nothing*. See No 5, 6, 7. Such is the doctrine of theſe eminent Pædobaptiſts, relating to this text, which is frequently produced againſt us with an air of confidence.

REFLECT. II. But ſuppoſing it were proved, in oppoſition to theſe learned authors, that the word *children* is here to be underſtood of infants, and that the term *promiſe* refers to remiſſion of ſins, in the preceding Verſe; our Brethren would be far from gaining their point: becauſe, unhappily for Infant baptiſm, there is nothing ſaid about the promiſe reſpecting any, beſides thoſe whom *the Lord our God ſhall* CALL. Yes, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, whether they be parents or children, they muſt be *called*, before this text will permit us to view them as intereſted in that promiſe of which it ſpeaks; which intirely excludes infants from all conſideration here. Beſides, our oppoſers themſelves are obliged to conſider the fulfilment of this promiſe, let the bleſſings included in it be what they may, as very much limited. For, either they view the gracious declaration as *abſolute*, or *conditional*. If the *former*, and if it refer to pardon, and peace, and life eternal, there can be no ſuch character as a

finally

finally impenitent perſon, whoſe parents were truly pious. This, however, few of our Brethren will dare to aſſert. Mr. MORRICE, indeed, ſeems to have been of that opinion*. Mr. ADDINGTON alſo, has an aſſertion which is very much like it; for, ſpeaking of this text, he ſays: "Herein pardon, grace, and glory, are promiſed to ſuch as repent and turn unto the Lord—This he [Peter] calls, by way of eminence, *The* promiſe; partly on account of the ſuperior value of the bleſſings engaged for in it, and partly becauſe *it ſecures the continued ſucceſſion of them* to the people of God *and their ſeed to the end of time*†". Candour compels me to ſuppoſe, that Mr. ADDINGTON did not well conſider the neceſſary conſequences of theſe poſitions, thus connected, or he would never have penned them. For, if thoſe ineffable bleſſings, pardon, grace, and glory, be not only promiſed to the people of God; but SECURED *to their ſeed* alſo, to the *end* of time; how ſhould the *immediate* offſpring of any believer—nay, how ſhould *any* of his deſcendents, in the remoteſt generations, fall ſhort of eternal bleſſedneſs? Becauſe, by the ſame rule that the immediate poſterity of a pious parent are aſſured of converting grace, of pardoning mercy, and of heavenly happineſs, are *their* immediate offſpring equally aſſured of the ſame bleſſings; and ſo on, till the whole of that lineal ſucceſſion ceaſe. According to which, all the Jews, as deſcending from Abraham; and all the poſt-diluvian world, as deſcending from Noah, would be ſecured of immortal felicity. Though I am far from imputing a ſentiment ſo erroneous to the worthy author, yet his unguarded aſſertion reminds me of what the Talmudiſts have ſaid,

* *Social Religion*, Dialogue VIII.

† *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſons*, p. 120.

ſaid, concerning the final ſafety of all the ſeed of Abraham. They tell us, "That Abraham ſits at the gates of hell, and does not permit any unrighteous Iſraelite to enter the infernal regions*." —If the promiſe before us be *conditional*, it muſt be limited to perſons of a certain character: and if limited, by what? The ſecret intention of God? but that can be no rule for the adminiſtration of baptiſm. By the text itſelf? then it muſt be by thoſe expreſſions, *As many as the Lord our God ſhall* CALL. For theſe words are, as plainly as poſſible, a limiting clauſe, and extend a reſtrictive force to the term *children*, as much as to the pronoun *you*, or to that deſcriptive language, *all that are afar off*. Conſequently, the promiſe is limited to ſuch as are *called* by the Lord our God: but, whether infants be of that number, the Reader will be at no loſs to determine.—Beſides, if the gracious intention of this promiſe be not thus limited, the paſſage will prove more than our oppoſers wiſh to eſtabliſh. For, as it would be abſurd to confine the term children to the *infants* of Peter's alarmed hearers; ſuch of their offspring as were capable of religious inſtruction, whether converted or not, muſt be conſidered as having had an equal title to baptiſm, with their infants: becauſe, on this view of the text, the promiſe was to *their children*, without exception.

Some of our opponents, I know, repreſent the diſtinct mention of *children*, in this paſſage, as a trifling affair, if underſtood according to our interpretation, and that of learned Pædobaptiſts already produced; becauſe the promiſe, thus conſidered, exhibits no ſpiritual bleſſings for the offspring of Peter's awakened hearers, in preference to the children of others.

* Apud LAMPIUM *Comment. in Evang. Johan.* ad Cap. viii. 33.

others. Our Brethren, however, seem to forget, that the mentioning of children, on this important occasion, was peculiarly proper to remove those painful fears, which, it is highly probable, some of the auditors then had respecting their offspring, on whom the blood of Immanuel had been solemnly imprecated but a little while before. Was it, then, a small thing to be informed, by the oracle of Heaven, that there was forgiveness with God for their own damnable crimes, and that the gift of the Spirit should not be witheld from their *children*, notwithstanding the enormous load of imprecated guilt under which they lay, whenever they should feel their want, and be willing to accept salvation as a blessing of divine grace? Or, would our opposers have the offspring of repenting sinners fitted for baptism and future felicity, by *other means* than Providence employs for the happiness of children whose parents are impenitent and ungodly? *Those*, when infants, to be intitled to baptism, and, if they leave the world in their infantile age, to eternal bliss, in virtue of *parental* piety; while *these*, except they arrive at years of discretion, and give evidence of regenerating grace, are to be treated as outcasts, both here and hereafter? The Talmud—a book to which our Brethren often refer us for information, respecting the proper subjects of baptism—the Talmud assures us, "That all the Israelites are the sons of *kings**;" but the compilers of that huge farrago consider the Gentiles in a very different point of light. Must *we*, then, or does the Almighty, make a similar distinction between the offspring of godly parents, and the children of impenitent sinners?

* Apud LAMPIUM, ut supra.

ners? The Scripture is far from aſſerting any ſuch thing. That heavenly Volume gives us abundant warrant, I think, to conclude, that as all are equally *the children of wrath by nature*, from whomſoever deſcended; ſo they muſt all be intereſted in ſpiritual bleſſings, and intitled to baptiſm, on the *ſame* grounds, or have no ſhare in the one or the other.

§ VII. ACTS xvi. 15. *When ſhe was baptized and her Houſehold*—ACTS xvi. 33. *And was baptized, he, and all his, ſtraightway*—1 COR. i. xvi. *I baptized alſo the Houſehold of Stephanas.*

DR. WHITBY: "And when ſhe, [Lydia,] and thoſe of her houſehold, were *inſtructed* in the Chriſtian faith, and in the nature of baptiſm required by it, ſhe was baptized, and her houſehold." *Paraphraſe*, on the place.

2. CALVIN: "Luke commends the pious zeal of the Jailor, becauſe he dedicated his whole houſe to the Lord; in which alſo the grace of God illuſtriouſly appeared, becauſe it ſuddenly brought the *whole family* to a pious conſent." *Comment.* in loc.

3. Mr. HENRY: "*He rejoiced, believing in God with all his houſe.* There was *none* in his [the Jailor's] houſe, that refuſed to be baptized, and ſo made a jar in the harmony; but they were *unanimous* in embracing the goſpel, which added much to the joy." *Expoſition*, on Acts xvi. 34.

4. Dr. HAMMOND: "I think it *unreaſonable* that the Apoſtle's bare mention of baptizing his [Stephanas's] houſehold, ſhould be thought competent to conclude, that infants were baptized by him;

him; when it is uncertain, whether there were any ſuch at all in his houſe." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 494.

5. LIMBORCH: "Whether any infants were in her houſe [Lydia's] is *uncertain*. An undoubted argument, therefore, cannot be drawn from this inſtance, by which it may be demonſtrated, that infants were baptized by the Apoſtles. It might be, that all in her houſe were of a mature age; who, as in the exerciſe of a ripe underſtanding they believed, ſo they were able alſo to make a public profeſſion of that faith, when they received baptiſm. As I neither will, nor can deny, that there were infants in that houſe; ſo, likewiſe, I cannot affirm the contrary—It may be urged [in favour of Infant baptiſm,] That we read of whole families being baptized, wherein, doubtleſs, there were ſome children. Anſw. As for my part, I will readily grant that there *might* be children in thoſe families; yet the Holy Spirit furniſhes me with no *ſolid argument*, whereby I can demonſtrate it evidently againſt others, who ſhall deny or queſtion the truth of it; ſince it does not expreſſly ſay there were any children in them. And though this ſhould be granted, yet we are not informed that they were baptized together with their parents: on the contrary, *all* thoſe who were baptized are ſaid to *give thanks to God*, which children could never do. So that at the moſt, this argument amounts to no more than *a bare probability*." *Comment.* in loc. *Syſtem of Div.* B. V. Chap. XXII. Sect. II.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Theſe Pædobaptiſts inform us, That it is *uncertain* whether there were any infants in the houſeholds here mentioned. See No 4, 5.—

That

That if there were, it affords no *ſolid ground* to conclude on their being baptized. See No 5—That the houſehold of Lydia was *inſtructed* in the Chriſtian faith. See No 1.—That the *whole family* of the Jailor were brought to a pious conſent, and were *unanimous* in embracing the goſpel. See No 2, 3. —That the argument from theſe paſſages only affords a *bare probability*, in favour of Infant baptiſm. See No 5.—And, that it is *unreaſonable* to conclude the Apoſtles baptized infants, merely becauſe the ordinance was adminiſtered to houſeholds. See No 4.

REFLECT. II. Here we have three paſſages of ſacred Writ, that are uſually pleaded by our oppoſers; in which, though baptiſm is mentioned, yet neither the word *infants*, nor the term *children*, occurs: and, that Dr. HAMMOND was not precipitate, in pronouncing it *unreaſonable* to infer the baptiſm of infants, from the baptizing of a houſehold, may, perhaps, more fully appear, if the following things be duly conſidered.—No ſubſtantial argument can be formed againſt us, on this ground, nor any legitimate concluſion drawn to authenticate Infant baptiſm, till it is proved, that it would be *abſurd* to underſtand the term *houſehold*, ſo as to exclude the idea of *infants:* and that, in the ſacred ſtile, when any thing is deſcribed as done to a houſehold, or performed by one, *every individual* belonging to ſuch family muſt be conſidered as intereſted in the tranſaction. But neither of theſe can be evinced. Not the *former:* for it is notorious, that many houſeholds conſiſt only of the maſter, the miſtreſs, and ſervants; and it is equally evident, that there are multitudes of families in which there are children, but no infants. Nay, it may admit of a query, whether, in this metropolis, a majority of houſeholds

houſeholds have any mere infants in them. Nor is the baptizing of a whole family, without example among the modern Baptiſts: yet our opponents will not thence infer, that they baptize infants, or approve of the practice. How vague, then, how futile muſt every argument in favour of Infant baptiſm be, which reſts on the term *houſehold*, as uſed in theſe paſſages!—Not the *latter:* for, were it proved, inconteſtibly proved, that infants made a part of the families here mentioned; it would not unavoidably follow, that thoſe infants were baptized, as LIMBORCH has well obſerved. Becauſe it is not uncommen for the ſacred Writers to aſſert this, or the other, concerning a houſehold, without any expreſs limitation; which is manifeſtly meant of only the *greater part:* and, in other places, the ſame general term is uſed, where none but adults can be intended. A few examples may here ſuffice. Thus it is written, 1 Sam. i. 21. *Elkanah, and* ALL HIS HOUSE, *went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly ſacrifice:* yet we are told, in the following Verſe, that Hannah, and the child Samuel, *went not up.* So, the pen of inſpiration informs us, that a nobleman at Capernaum *believed, and his* WHOLE HOUSE; that Cornelius *feared God with* ALL HIS HOUSE; that *unruly talkers ſubvert* WHOLE HOUSES; that Paul and his companion *ſpake the word of the Lord* to this Philippian jailor, *and to* ALL *that were in his houſe*; that *he rejoiced, believing in God with* ALL HIS HOUSE; that Criſpus *believed in the Lord, with* ALL HIS HOUSE; and that *the houſe* of Stephanas ADDICTED THEMSELVES *to the miniſtry of the ſaints* *; in all which examples, infants muſt be ex-

* See Joh. iv. 53. Acts x. 2. Tit. i. 10, 11. Acts xvi. 32. 34. and xviii. 8. 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

cepted. And, as to the caſe of Lydia, there is no intimation that ſhe was a married woman, but rather the contrary; for the expreſſion is, HER *houſehold.* But, ſuppoſing her to have had a huſband, as Philippi, where ſhe was merchandizing, does not ſeem to have been the place of her ſtated reſidence, but Thyatira*; it is the more unlikely, if ſhe had any children, that infants ſhould make a part of her houſehold at the time to which the text refers.

Further: As the argument here manifeſtly turns on the term *houſehold*, it will, if it have any force, prove too much for the generality of our oppoſers; becauſe we may, with equal propriety, reaſon thus. The apoſtolic example muſt be followed. By this example we are informed, that the maſter of a family, profeſſing faith, his *intire houſehold* was baptized along with him. But his adult offspring, and his domeſtics, whether converted or not, were *part* of the houſehold; and, conſequently, were baptized. When, therefore, the maſter of a family profeſſes faith and is baptized, his children at years of diſcretion, and ſervants alſo, are intitled to baptiſm, whether they be converted or not.—Thus Mr. BLAKE ſeems to have underſtood the apoſtolic precedents; for he ſpeaks in the following manner. "We have examples not to be contemned of the baptizing *whole houſeholds*; and whether infants were there or no, as it is not certain, though probable, ſo it is not material. The precedent is, *an houſehold.* He that followeth the precedent, muſt baptize *houſeholds.* It appears not that any *wife* was there; yet he that followeth the precedent, muſt baptize *wives*; and ſo I may ſay, *ſervants*, if they be of the houſehold †." If, therefore,

* WOLFII *Curæ*, ad Acts xvi. 14.

† In Mr TOMBES's *Examen*, p. 141.

fore, our oppoſers would be true to their argument, by acting conſiſtently with it, they muſt, when called to baptize the maſter of a family, adminiſter the ſame ordinance to his wife, his children, and his domeſtics, without exception, if not baptized before, whether they profeſs repentance towards God, and faith in Chriſt, or not. For the example, as Mr. BLAKE obſerves, is *an houſehold:* on that *very word*, their own argument reſts; and theſe characters conſtitute the *bulk* of ſuch a ſociety. Thus alſo they will be more conſiſtent with themſelves, in regard to their argument from *circumciſion*, and more conformable to the *precedent* ſet them by Abraham, in reference to that affair.——. This, however, our Brethren do not approve. For though the law of baptiſm be but *one*, and though the qualifications expreſſly required by it are *the ſame* in every proper ſubject; yet, ſtrange as it may appear, the baptizing of houſeholds muſt, at all events, be conſidered as *including* infants, that *cannot* believe; and as *excluding* all the reſt of the family, if they *do not* believe. You muſt know, then, that the term *houſehold*, in this connection, is of a ſingular nature: for it often treats, with a diſtant reſerve, and with generous complaiſance, the different members of the *ſame* family. Are you, for inſtance, inclined to oppoſe Mr. BLAKE, who argues from it in favour of his hypotheſis? you may eaſily ſhew, that when the maſter of a family is baptized on a profeſſion of faith, the word *houſehold* muſt not be underſtood as extending to either his *wife*, his *adult offſpring*, or any of his *domeſtics*, except they believe. Have you a mind to confute the Baptiſts, who harp ſo much on a *profeſſion* of faith, as neceſſary to baptiſm? this identical word will open its friendly boſom to embrace infants, and

ſecure

ſecure their title to that inſtitution, though incapable of repentance or faith. For, Janus like, it has two faces, reſpecting the ſame family, and will turn the one or the other towards its different objects, juſt as your cauſe demands.—But, pleaſantry apart, our Brethren ſeem to forget, that the ordinance about which we contend, is a *poſitive* inſtitution; and that the only rule of its adminiſtration is divine law, or apoſtolic example; and not dubious conjecture, which is the utmoſt that can be ſuppoſed here: for none, that I know of, pretend a *certainty* that there were infants in any of theſe baptized families. There is too much reaſon, therefore, to ſuſpect, that the love of hypotheſis and the want of ſolid arguments, excite many of our oppoſers to produce the paſſages before us with ſuch an air of confidence as they often do.

§ VIII. ROM. xi. 16. *For if the firſt Fruit be holy, the Lump is alſo holy: and if the Root be holy, ſo are the Branches.*

TOLETUS and MENOCHIUS: "Paul here denominates the firſt Jews that were converted to the faith, namely, the Apoſtles and diſciples of our Lord, *firſt fruits*; and he calls the firſt patriarchs, the *root*." Apud POLI *Synopſin*, in loc.

2. VENEMA: "The word *holy*, as here uſed, ſignifies the dedication of a thing, or a perſon, ſacred to God. Now, ſeeing the Jews that believed, in the time of Paul, fitly anſwer to the firſt patriarchs, eſpecially Abraham, he conſiders them as a happy token and example, whence he might lawfully hope for the future converſion of that people; and that the maſs

maſs and the branches, laid aſide for the ſame uſe, ſhould be gathered together, and, in their own time, become *holy*, like the *firſt fruits and root*, and be afreſh implanted in their own olive tree." *Commentarius ad Malach.* p. 565.

3. Dr. DODDRIDGE: "*For if the firſt-fruits be holy, ſo is the lump.* The conſecration of them was looked upon as in effect the conſecration of all. And ſo would I look upon the converſion of ſome few of the Jewiſh nation, as an earneſt of the converſion of all the reſt. And ſo much the rather, when I conſider, how eminently dear to God thoſe pious patriarchs were from whom they have deſcended: for *if the root be holy, the branches are likewiſe ſo*, and will ſurely at length be regarded as ſuch." *Paraphraſe* on the place.

REFLECTION.

Here it may be obſerved, that baptiſm is not the ſubject of Paul's diſcourſe: it is not mentioned in the whole Chapter: nor, ſo far as appears, is it ſo much as thought of by the Apoſtle; much leſs, *Infant* baptiſm. But the word *holy* is mentioned. True; yet, according to theſe Commentators, and agreeable to the ſcope of the place, it is in reference to the *ancient patriarchs*, eſpecially Abraham: in reference to thoſe converted Jews, that were the *firſt fruits* of a Chriſtian miniſtry: and in reference to the *future converſion* of Abraham's poſterity, in the latter day: ſo that the paſſage has no regard to any Chriſtian parent, as a *root*; or to his infant offſpring, as *branches* ariſing from it. Yet, in this light, ſome of our Brethren ſeem to underſtand the text, as appears by the following inſtances. "The Chriſtian, ſays Mr. ADDINGTON, is to his or her family as the

the root of theſe branches; and, upon the principles here laid down, he or ſhe being holy, ſo are they *."—"This proves that the ſeed of believers, *as ſuch*, ſays Mr. HENRY, are within the pale of the viſible church, and within the verge of the covenant, till they do, by their unbelief, throw themſelves out; for *if the root be holy, ſo are the branches*. Though real qualifications be not propagated, yet relative privileges are. Though a wiſe man do not beget a wiſe man, yet a free man begets a free man. Though grace doth not run in the blood, yet external privileges do, till they are forfeited, even to a thouſand generations. Look how they will anſwer it another day, that cut off the entail, by turning the ſeed of the faithful out of the church, and ſo *not allowing the bleſſing of Abraham to come upon the Gentiles*. The Jewiſh branches are reckoned holy, becauſe the root was ſo †."—*Not allow the bleſſing of Abraham to come on the Gentiles!* Truly, Mr. HENRY, this is very ſevere! Happily for us, however, though we hear the thunder roar, we are neither *much hurt*, nor *greatly provoked*, nor *ſadly frightned*. Not the *firſt*; for our cauſe is yet ſafe, except it be proved, that every Chriſtian parent is under the ſame *peculiar OEconomy* with Abraham—that his children are intereſted in the ſame *temporal promiſes* and *eccleſiaſtical privileges*, as thoſe of that illuſtrious Ancient—that the *Sinai* covenant is yet in force—and that there is an *equal certainty* of a believer's romote deſcendents, after a long apoſtacy, being converted in the latter day, as there is that Abraham's poſterity ſhall be ſo. Not the *ſecond*; for though we do not admire this obſervation of the celebrated Commentator, we reſpect his

* *Chriſtian Miniſter's Reaſons*, p. 80.

† *Expoſition*, on the place.

his character, and are unfeignedly thankful to Providence for many of his practical remarks. Not the *laſt*; for though we heard the terrible exploſion, it was at a diſtance; and we are ſtill capable of reflecting, that the *principles* on which our Expoſitor here proceeds, are more becoming a member of the ancient Synagogue, than a paſtor in the Chriſtian church; and more conſiſtent with the creed of a National Eſtabliſhment, than with that of a Proteſtant Diſſenter. See SECT. III. REFLECT. II. of this Chapter.—But, if the cenſure of Mr. HENRY be ſevere, what is that of Mr. BAXTER? who at the end of a long liſt of diſmal charges laid againſt the Baptiſts, adds; "Laſtly, they do plainly play the *devil's* part, in accuſing their *own children* and diſputing them out of the *church* and *houſe* of God, and out of his *promiſes* and *covenant*, and the *privileges* that accompany them; and moſt ungratefully deny, reject, and plead againſt the mercies that Chriſt hath purchaſed for their children, and made over to them *." Ah! Reader, did you ever meet with ſuch a terrible "*laſtly*" as this, from the pen of a Proteſtant Nonconformiſt, againſt his Diſſenting Brethren? It wants only the *anathema* of a Popiſh Council, to make the cenſure quite complete; and the *priſon of the Inquiſition*, that theſe abettors of Satan may receive their deſerved puniſhment.

* *Plain Scripture Proof*, p. 13.

§ IX.

§ IX. 1 Cor. vii. 14. *The unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband: else were your Children unclean; but now are they holy.*

Mr. Poole's Continuators: "*The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife*—— I rather think it signifies brought into such a state, that the believer, without offence to the law of God, may continue in a married state, with such a yoke fellow; and the state of marriage is an holy state, notwithstanding the disparity with reference to religion." *Annotations*, on the place.

2. Camerarius: "*The unbelieving husband hath been sanctified*—That is, sanctified in the lawful use of marriage. For without this, the Apostle says, the children would be *unclean*; that is, infamous, not being *legitimate*. Thus they are *holy*; that is, during the marriage, they are free from every spot of ignominy." *In loc.*

3. Vatablus: "*The unbelieving husband is sanctified.* That is, the husband, though unclean, shall be accounted pure, in reference to matrimonial commerce; otherwise the children would not be legitimate, who, nevertheless, are legitimate." *In loc.*

4. Cameron: "*Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.* This holiness of which the Apostle speaks, is not opposed to that impurity which by nature properly agrees to all, on account of Adam's offence; but to that impurity of which believing wives were apprehensive, from their *cohabiting* with unbelieving husbands." *In loc.*

5. Ma-

5. MALANCTHON: "Paul anſwers, that the marriages are not to be pulled aſunder, for their unlike opinions of God, if the impious perſon do not caſt away the other: and for comfort he adds, as a reaſon, *The unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the believing wife.* Of which ſpeech divers interpretations are made, but the true and natural is this, as elſe where he ſaith; *Meat is ſanctified* for that which is holy in uſe, that is, granted to believers from God. So here he ſpeaks the uſe of marriage to be holy, and to be granted of God—The connection of the argument is this: If the uſe of marriage ſhould not pleaſe God, your children would be *baſtards*, and ſo *unclean*; but your children are not baſtards, therefore the uſe of marriage pleaſeth God. How baſtards were unclean in a peculiar manner, the law ſhews, Deut. xxiii. *Let not a baſtard enter into the congregation of the Lord, to the tenth generation.*" In Mr. TOMBES's *Exercitation*, p. 11.

6. WOLFIUS: "The *generality* of our Lutheran divines underſtand the *ſanctification of the unbelieving partner*, only in this ſenſe; Paul aſſerts, that a marriage of this kind ought to be eſteemed *lawful* and *firm* by Chriſtians, though only one of the parties profeſs the name of Chriſt." *Curæ*, in loc.

7. VITRINGA: "We would have it obſerved, the Apoſtle does not mean, that all the children of believers and ſaints are truly partakers of the Holy Spirit, and by him ingrafted into the body of the church: for there is no promiſe of this prerogative made to believing parents; nay, rather, the events of every day teach the contrary. You ſee parents that love and worſhip God, and educate their children in the fear of God; you ſee children, in this reſpect, exceedingly different from their parents, and of contrary

trary diſpoſitions. He who reads the hiſtory of the kings of Judah, will meet, as it were alternately, with a *virtuous* father, and a *wicked* ſon and grandſons; and from theſe, again, an offspring that is acceptable to God——Seeing it is manifeſt, therefore, that the children of believers are not called *holy*, becauſe they are all actuated by the Holy Spirit; the generality of our divines recur to an *external holineſs*, which has its original from an *external covenant*. So that the children of believers are *holy*, becauſe, ſeparated from the world, they live and are educated in the communion of the external church, and are partakers of the ſymbols of the external church. Like as the Iſraelites, in former times, being choſen out of the other nations of the world, are called a *holy nation*, Exod. xix. 6. though a very great part of them was impure; and their children are denominated a *holy ſeed*, Ezra ix. 2. compared with Neh. ix. 2. And it is undoubtedly true, that, in Iſrael according to the fleſh, there was an *external* and *typical holineſs*; ariſing from an *external* covenant, which conſiſted in *external precepts* (the Scripture calls them *carnal*, becauſe the *fleſh* is the exterior part of man) and alſo *external promiſes*, which the Scripture calls *worſe* than the promiſes of the New Covenant; in which external covenant, the internal covenant of grace was involved. For ſo God was pleaſed to act in the OEconomy of thoſe times. And this God ſignified to Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7. when he ſaid, that he would *make a covenant*, not only with Abraham, but alſo *with his ſeed*. Now the promiſes of that covenant, which are there mentioned, are both *ſpiritual* and *carnal*, which circumciſion ſealed. An intereſt in *theſe*, was conferred on the whole ſeed of Abraham, whether *pure* or *impure*; but a right to

thoſe,

thoſe, was limited to the *ſpiritual* ſeed of Abraham; that is, to them that ſhould believe in Chriſt, and by faith obtain righteouſneſs and life. Paul, to the Romans, expreſſly ſays; *They which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God; but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed*, Rom. ix. 8. Thus alſo thoſe learned men ſeem to conceive of this paſſage, that it is the *external holineſs* of thoſe who give up themſelves to the church, ſo far as they are ſeparated from the world: in the multitude of whom, ſeeing there are infants, hence alſo they are called *holy*, as the infants of the Iſraelites in former ages. But this is *inconſiſtent* with the clear doctrine of the divine word, and *abſolutely contrary* to the genius of the New Covenant—So far from an external holineſs of this kind having any place under the New Teſtament, that, on the contrary, this is the prerogative of the New Teſtament, or Covenant, THAT NO ONE BELONGS TO IT, EXCEPT HE BE TRULY SANCTIFIED: no one is called *holy*, except he be truly conſidered as *internally* holy; and in this conſiſts the difference between the Old and the New Covenant, that *this* is intirely *ſpiritual*, intirely *internal*. The precepts and promiſes of it, are internal: it acknowledges none as covenantees, but thoſe that are truly ſanctified, or accounted for ſuch. But *that* had both *carnal precepts* and *carnal promiſes*; and it alſo admitted covenantees that were ceremonially clean, though not pure in heart—The infants of believing parents are therefore called *holy*, becauſe we juſtly preſume, that they are ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, in their parents. For ſeeing God has conferred his grace on the parents, or on one of the parents, by a judgement of charity we preſume that he will afford the ſame grace to the infants, as long

long as the contrary is not manifeſt to us. And this is the reaſon why the children of *unbelievers* are not admitted to baptiſm; becauſe we are ſupplied with no argument or foundation, by which, in a judgment of charity, we ſhould be perſuaded, that God will communicate his grace to them." *Obſervat. Sac.* L. II. C. VI. § 25, 26, 27, 28.

8. Lord BROOKE: "*Elſe were your children uncleau, but now are they holy.* I know ſome interpret it thus: If it be unlawful for a believer to live in wedlock with one that believeth not, then have many of you lived a long time in unlawful marriage; and ſo your very children muſt be illegitimate, and theſe alſo muſt be caſt off, as baſe born: but this is not ſo; for your children are *holy*, that is, *legitimate*. I confeſs this ſeems a *very fair* interpretation; yet I much queſtion whether this be all the Apoſtle means by that phraſe, *holy*; eſpecially when I reflect on the preceding words, *The unbeliever is ſanctified by the believer*. Nor yet can I believe any *inherent* holineſs is here meant; but rather that *relative church-holineſs*, which makes a man capable of admiſſion to holy ordinances, and ſo to *baptiſm*; YEA, AND TO THE LORD'S SUPPER ALSO, FOR AUGHT I SEE: except, perhaps, infants be excluded from this ſacrament, by that text, *Let him that eateth examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat.*" *Diſcourſe on Epiſcopacy*, Sect. II. Chap. VII. p. 97, 98.

9. MUSCULUS: "The moſt plain underſtanding of this place is, firſt, in that we underſtand not the word *holineſs*, of that holineſs which is by the covenant of God, or the Spirit of faith, by which believers are ſanctified as a people of God, but of the holineſs of the *conjugal bed*; otherwiſe it will bring forth a troubleſome diſpute, how an unbelieving huſband

huſband may be ſaid to be ſanctified. Then, that we attribute this ſanctification, that is cleanneſs, not to the *faith* of the believing yokefellow, but to the *marriage*, by reaſon of the appointment of God; with HIEROME, who ſaith, *Becauſe by God's appointment, marriage is holy*; and AMBROSE, who hath it thus, *The children are holy, becauſe they are born of lawful marriage*—I have ſometimes *abuſed* the preſent place againſt the error of Anabaptiſts, keeping back infants of Chriſtians from baptiſm; thinking that ſpeech, *But now are they holy*, to be the ſame, as, *They are the people of God*, by reaſon of the believing parents: but although it be ſure in itſelf, that the children of believers are both holy, and pertaining to the people of God, by reaſon of the participation of the covenant, and ſo are partakers of baptiſm as the ſign of the covenant; yet the preſent place makes *nothing to this cauſe*, in which the ſanctimony of the covenant and people is not meddled with, but the cleanneſs of lawful marriage, even of infidels. For not only to *children*, to whom, perhaps, the holineſs of a believing parent may ſo appertain, that for it they may be partakers of the covenant; but alſo to *unbelieving huſbands and wives* is ſanctimony aſcribed, although they oppoſe the Chriſtian faith. Nor is any other holineſs or cleanneſs of children meddled with, than that which agrees alſo to unbelieving parents; for to them no other agrees, than that which is by lawful marriage." In Mr. TOMBES's *Exercitation concerning Inf. Bap.* p. 12, 13.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. From theſe quotations we learn, That the ſanctification of the unbelieving huſband, relates intirely to *matrimonial commerce*. See No. 1, 2, 3. 5, 6. 9—That the holineſs of the children is not

not of an *external* kind, ariſing from an *external* OEconomy; the New Covenant being altogether ſpiritual and internal. See No 7—That the holineſs intended is *legitimacy*. See No 4, 5. 9—That no holineſs is here aſcribed to children, which does not agree to the *unbelieving* parent. See No 9—And, that this paſſage affords *no argument* for infant baptiſm. *Ibid.* Such are the ſentiments of theſe learned Pædobaptiſts, concerning the remarkable text.

REFLECT. II. It is very obſervable, that though this paſſage is, perhaps, more frequently urged and more confidently pleaded againſt us than any other, in vindication of Infant baptiſm; yet there is not a word in it, nor in all the Chapter, concerning baptiſm, any more than about the ſacred ſupper. The cauſe of Pædobaptiſm ſeems, indeed, to be very unhappily circumſtanced. For, if a paſſage produced in its favour mention *baptiſm*, it ſays nothing of *infants*; as in § I. and VII. If it mention *ſeed*, or *ſons*, or *little children*, or, indefinitely, *an individual*, it ſays nothing of *baptiſm*; as in § II, III, IV, and V. If it mention *children*, in connection with the term *promiſe*, the word *baptized*, being in the context; it very untowardly falls out, that the bleſſing promiſed is not *baptiſm*, nor does the word children, ſignify *infants*, as in § VI. If it mention *firſt fruits* and *lump*, *root* and *branches*; the ſacred Writer neither *ſpeaks* of baptiſm, nor ſeems to have had any *thought* about it, as in § VIII. So here, though *children* are mentioned, and though they are denominated *holy*; yet there is a deep ſilence about *baptiſm*. If, therefore, Infant baptiſm be a divine appointment, the predicament in which it ſtands, as a *poſitive* rite, muſt be quite peculiar—ſo peculiar, that we may challenge our oppoſers to produce a ſimilar inſtance, relating

relating to a *ritual* ſervice, and allowed by Proteſtants to have a divine warrant.

But, is it not ſtrange, is it not abſolutely unaccountable, if our Lord intended infants ſhould be baptized, and if they actually were baptized by the Apoſtles, that it ſhould not be ſo much as *once* expreſſly recorded in all the New Teſtament? Baptiſm itſelf, is frequently mentioned—mentioned, as an appointment of Chriſt, as a duty to be performed, as an ordinance often adminiſtered, as a motive to holineſs of life, and alſo by way of alluſion; yet though all theſe occaſions of expreſſly mentioning infants as *intitled* to baptiſm, or as *partakers* of it, repeatedly occurred; the ſacred Writers have united in obſerving a *profound ſilence* with reſpect both to the one and the other. Admitting the baptiſm of infants to be from heaven, the ſilence of inſpired Authors on this head is the more ſurpriſing, becauſe they were far from being backward *expreſſly* to mention children on other occaſions of much leſs importance than this, to the purity of Chriſtian worſhip and the conduct of believing parents. For inſtance: Do infants fall a ſacrifice to envy and cruelty, by the ſanguinary edict of an Egyptian tyrant, or the bloody order of an infamous Herod? they are *expreſſly mentioned*, Acts vii. 19. Mat. ii. 16. Do children partake with their parents, once and again, of miraculous food? they are *expreſſly mentioned*, a firſt and a ſecond time, Mat. xiv. 21. and xv. 38. Are little children preſented to Chriſt, for his healing touch, or his heavenly bleſſing? they are *expreſſly mentioned*, by three Evangeliſts, Mat. xix. 13. Mark x. 13. Luke xviii. 15. Did children, along with their parents, attend Paul, when taking his leave of the diſciples at the

the city of Tyre? they alſo are *expreſſly mentioned*, Acts xxi. 5. Now, though the particular mention of children in all theſe caſes was pertinent, they being concerned in the ſeveral tranſactions recorded; yet, as none of theſe inſtances refers to a poſitive ordinance of divine worſhip, of which kind baptiſm is; as the infallible Writers knew, that it would be impoſſible for future infants to be in a ſimilar ſituation with ſome of theſe, and quite unlawful to treat any children, as others of theſe were treated; ſo we may ſafely conclude, that, if our Lord had warranted, and if the Apoſtles had practiſed, Infant baptiſm, it was of much greater importance to the church of God, for the ſacred Writers *expreſſly* to have mentioned it, than for them to have been ſo particular in the caſes here adduced. But infants are *not* expreſsly ſaid to be baptized, our opponents themſelves being judges: conſequently, we may conclude, that infants were not then concerned in any ſuch tranſaction.

Again: Does Luke inform us, when deſcribing the outrageous conduct of Saul, that he *committed men and women to priſon*, without mentioning *children?* the ſame inſpired Hiſtorian, relating the triumphs of divine truth, tells us, that when the Samaritans believed, they were *baptized, both men and women*; but ſays not a word of infants. Acts viii. 3. 12. If, then, we juſtly infer, that little children were not the objects of Saul's perſecuting rage, becauſe they are *not mentioned* as ſuch, in the hiſtory of his cruelty; why may we not, with equal juſtice conclude, that infants were not the ſubjects of baptiſm, as adminiſtered by Philip, the ſacred Writer being *intirely ſilent* about them, in his narrative of that Evangeliſt's miniſtry? It was, undoubtedly, as much the buſineſs of Luke to relate with

with explicit preciſion, what Philip did in the courſe of his evangelical miniſtry; as it was to narrate the perſecuting conduct of a blind bigot, who endeavoured to exterminate the Chriſtian cauſe: and a plain account of the *former*, was of incomparably more importance to ſucceeding generations, than the moſt accurate information reſpecting the *latter*. For Philip's beneficent labours, in preaching and baptizing, are an example which the miniſters of Chriſt are obliged to imitate; but the perſecuting conduct of Saul, we are all bound to deteſt. Muſt we, then, conſider the Hiſtorian, when mentioning *men and women*, in Verſe the *third*, as meaning *adults only*; but, in Verſe the *twelfth*, where he uſes thoſe very words, as intending parents and their *infant offspring*? Nothing but the rage of hypotheſis can ſuggeſt the thought. If, then, common ſenſe and common honeſty unite in affixing the ſame ideas to the ſame words, in each of thoſe places; the concluſion is obvious. For, either *no infants* were baptized in thoſe days; or Philip *departed* from the uſual practice. To prove the *latter*, will be an arduous taſk: to grant the *former*, is giving up the cauſe.—Our opponents inſiſt, that the Writers of the New Teſtament were *all* Pædobaptiſts. But, either this is a great miſtake, or thoſe venerable Authors muſt have had a very low eſteem of their own practice—much lower than CYPRIAN, or AUSTIN, or any of our zealous oppoſers in the preſent age. For, while thoſe infallible Writers mention *children*, on various occaſions, where baptiſm is not concerned; they relate the baptizing of great numbers, in different parts of the world, without once mentioning *infants* as parties in that affair. Nay, they relate the baptizing of believers, in different places, with as little notice of infants, as if

no infant had belonged to any whom they did baptize: yet, ſtrange to conceive, the hypotheſis of our opponents manifeſtly implies, that Infant baptiſm was then a *very common* practice! Now, as this is an example which no eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, allowed to have been a Pædobaptiſt, has choſen to imitate; and as it is an example which could not be imitated, when recording the tranſactions of later times, without omitting facts that were eſſential to a good narrative; ſo there is ground to believe, that the inſpired Hiſtorians had really *no facts* to relate, concerning the baptiſm of infants; which is a ſufficient reaſon for their ſaying nothing about it. For, ſurely, they were not inferior to later hiſtorians, either as to ſpiritual wiſdom, or holy zeal, or hiſtoric fidelity; nor could they be ignorant, that the immortal productions of their pens were to be conſidered, by all the diſciples of Chriſt, not only as a mirrour of paſt facts, but alſo as *the law* of divine worſhip, and *the rule* of religious conduct, in all future generations.—The following words of an Epiſcopalian author, concerning Pædobaptiſt Diſſenters, ſhall conclude this Reflection. "If I had ſeen it my duty to accede to the church order of the Independents, I know not but their principles would have led me from them again to join with the Baptiſts. How they, who, maintaining Infant baptiſm, preſs ſcripture precedent ſo ſtrongly upon *me*, anſwer the *Baptiſts*, who, in this point, preſs it *as ſtrongly upon themſelves*, is not my concern*." See CHAP. VIII. REFLECT. II—V.

REFLECT.

* Mr. NEWTON's *Apologia*, p. 108. Leaving our Independent Brethren to ſolve the difficulty here ſuggeſted, I ſhall only obſerve; That as this worthy author informs us he made the ſubſcription required of candidates for orders in the National Eſtabliſhment,

" REALLY

REFLECT. III. But let us conſider the paſſage a little more particularly. We obſerve, then, that as the ordinance of baptiſm is not the ſubject of Paul's diſcourſe, either in the text or context; all arguments formed upon it muſt be far fetched, feeble, and inconcluſive: for our Brethren ſhould not forget, that the matter in debate is a *poſitive* inſtitution. This being the caſe, we cannot argue, on the one ſide or on the other, as in *moral* duties, from remote principles, general truths, and moral conſiderations. The adminiſtration of baptiſm is no more under the regulation

"REALLY *ex animo*;" ſo we may take it for granted he cordially approves of that Article in the National Creed which ſays, "The church hath power to decree *rites* or *ceremonies*." This being the caſe, it is no wonder that he does not feel himſelf much embarraſſed by the thought of departing from *ſcriptural precedents*. Becauſe whoever has authority to decree *new* rites and ceremonies in religious worſhip, muſt poſſeſs a plenitude of power to lay *old* ones aſide, by whomſoever they were appointed. But though Mr. NEWTON does not conſider himſelf as obliged, by *ſcriptural precedents*; and though he expreſsly ſays, "I thought the example of our Lord pleaded AS MUCH for *circumciſion* as for *baptiſm*;" yet while he abides by this acknowledgment, "I am BOUND, by my ſubſcription, to the form and *rubric* of the Common Prayer;" it might be expected that he would never publickly *ſprinkle* an infant, and call the ceremony *baptiſm*, unleſs the ſponſors informed him that the child could not well bear immerſion. For a Proteſtant miniſter to think himſelf at liberty to *deſert* ſcriptural precedents, while he confeſſes himſelf *bound* to the rubric of a liturgy; and yet notoriouſly contradict that *very rubric*, by conſtantly ſprinkling infants inſtead of immerſing them; are things, I confeſs, which grate on my underſtanding. See *Apologia*, p. 108, 109. 124.

regulation of this paſſage, than that of the holy ſupper is under the direction of Joh. vi. 53—56. nothing being ſaid about either of thoſe appointments, in either of theſe texts. Now Proteſtant authors, when diſputing with Papiſts, will not allow the latter of theſe paſſages to prove any thing, in reference to communion at the Lord's table. Conſider the reaſoning in the following words, and ſee if it will not apply in the caſe before us. "If the Lord's ſupper is not the *direct ſubject* of the diſcourſe, [Joh. vi. 53—56] but quite another thing;—— then, ſays Dr. HUGHES, nothing can be inferred from it, or built upon it, which relates to it. If our Lord is not *profeſſedly* ſpeaking of the ſacrament, but of believing in him, and embracing his doctrine; then it cannot be inferred from hence, that we eat his fleſh and drink his blood, in a literal ſenſe, in the Lord's ſupper. For it would be an inference without any foundation, and would be infering one thing of a quite different nature, from another: as if I ſhould ſay, *'Tis mid day, becauſe 'tis high tide*; or *dark night, becauſe 'tis low ebb*; where there is no neceſſary connection. We might, at this rate, infer any thing, from any thing, and argue without any principles to proceed upon, and draw concluſions without premiſes——If the Lord's ſupper is not the *direct* ſubject of it, however it may be *alluded* to, but ſpiritual eating and drinking by faith; a *mere alluſion* can be no ſufficient ground to raiſe any doctrine whatſoever—It would be foreign to the matter, if the doctrine were never ſo true, and could not, at leaſt, be inferred or proved from thence*."—Now, if it be abſurd for the votaries of Rome, to argue from Joh. vi. in favour of tranſubſtantiation,

* *Second Diſcourſe concerning Tranſubſtan.* p. 24, 25. Edit. 2d.

ſubſtantiation, becauſe our Lord is not there ſpeaking directly about his own ſupper; becauſe it is infering one thing, from another of a quite different nature; and becauſe a mere alluſion cannot be a ſufficient ground on which to raiſe any doctrine: then, ſurely, our opponents do not act prudently, in arguing from 1 Cor vii. 14. Becauſe it is manifeſt, that baptiſm is not the direct ſubject of Paul's diſcourſe; becauſe it is infering one thing, from another of a quite different kind; and becauſe a bare alluſion to baptiſm, of which there is no appearance, is not a proper foundation for any doctrine, and much leſs for the adminiſtration of a *poſitive* rite, to any deſcription of ſubjects.

REFLECT. IV. The incompetency of this paſſage to prove the lawfulneſs of Infant baptiſm will further appear, if the following things be conſidered. Whatever the Apoſtle intends by the term *holy*, as here applied to children, one of whoſe parents is a believer; it is not confined to the *infants* of ſuch perſons, but belongs to *all* their offſpring, whether younger or older; whether born *before* the converſion of either parent, or after that happy event had taken place: for the *children*, without any diſtinction, are pronounced holy. If, therefore, it be lawful to baptize them on the ground of this holineſs, while infants, it muſt be equally ſo when grown up.—That holineſs of which the inſpired Author ſpeaks, is not inferred from the *faith* of the believing parent, but from the *ſanctification* of the unbelieving party, by, or to, the believer. See No 9. Whence it follows, that the holineſs of the children cannot be ſuperior, either as to nature or degree, to the ſanctification of the unbelieving partner, from which it is derived. For Paul as expreſsly aſſerts, that the unbelieving huſband *hath been ſanctified*,

tified, or *made holy*, (ηγιασται) *by*, or to, *the wife*; and that the unbelieving wife *hath been ſanctified*, or made holy, (ηγιασται) *by*, or to, *the huſband*; as that the offspring of ſuch parents are *holy*, ἁγια. And ſo BENGELIUS conſiders the holineſs of the *children*, and of the *unbelieving* parent, as *the ſame*; becauſe ηγιασται, and ἁγια εστιν, differ only as, to be *made holy*, differs from, to *be holy* *. If, then, that ſanctification of the unbelieving huſband, gives him no claim to baptiſm; the holineſs thence ariſing cannot inveſt his *children* with ſuch a right.

Further: Whatever be the holineſs here deſigned, we have reaſon enough to conclude it is not like that of the ancient Jewiſh offspring; which conſiſted in being the lawful iſſue of a Jew and a Jeweſs. For if an Iſraelite married a Heatheniſh woman, and had children by her, they were not accounted an *holy* ſeed. Ezra ix. 2. Nehem. ix. 2. Whereas, it is highly probable, the Apoſtle is here ſpeaking of *two Gentiles*; one of them converted, the other not, whom he *forbids* to ſeparate on account of the Chriſtian faith: while, on the contrary, the Jews were *commanded* to put away their Heatheniſh wives, even after having had iſſue by ſuch marriages. This external, relative holineſs of the choſen tribes, intirely ceaſed, when that peculiar Diſpenſation to which it belonged became extinct. Conſequently, as holineſs of this kind has no exiſtence under the New OEconomy, no argument for Infant baptiſm can be derived from it.

Mr. HENRY will have it, that federal holineſs is *propagated* by Chriſtian parents to their children †: which brings to rememberance, what ſome Rabbinical doctors have ſaid concerning the propagation of holineſs. "Bleſſed, ſays a Jewiſh author, are the

* *Gnomon*, in loc. † *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 108.

the righteous, who give themſelves up to the law; who know the ways of the holy, bleſſed God; who exerciſe themſelves in the holineſs of the King, and are found holy in all things. Therefore, they receive the Holy Spirit from above; *their children* are truly holy, and are called the holy ſons of the King." "When a man walks in a good way, ſays another of theſe blind guides, he attracts to himſelf all holy ſpirits; and the ſon whom *he generates*, proceeds from the part of a holy ſpirit. But if he walk in a bad way, he derives on himſelf a polluting ſpirit, and the ſon whom he begets proceeds from the ſide of impurity *." The learned Lutheran, to whom I am obliged for theſe extracts, lays before us a third quotation; for which, though it contains a *recipe* of great importance to the tranſmiſſion of holineſs by carnal deſcent, I muſt refer the Reader to the Author himſelf.—How far any of our opponents may approve of theſe Rabbinical fancies, I cannot pretend to ſay; but there is reaſon to think, that the doctrine of an external, relative, and federal holineſs, for which ſo many of them earneſtly plead, was derived from the ancient Synagogue; and that it is much more becoming the creed of a Jew, than the faith of a Chriſtian.

Some Pædobaptiſts have thought, that the children are called *holy*, becauſe they had been *baptized*; but others of them oppoſe it, as an idea foreign to the text. So the famous Mr. CLAUDE, for inſtance, when reaſoning on the paſſage, ſays: "Behold, now, on what the Apoſtle founds this holineſs, and whence he derives it. Is it from *baptiſm?* Doubtleſs it is not. Of this he ſays not one word; and it would be injurious to draw it from thence †."—Nor is the idea

* Apud SCHOETTGENIUM, *Horæ Heb.* p. 608. † *Les Oeuvres Poſthumes*, Tome Cinqu. XVII. Lettre, p. 94, 95.

idea of ſuch children being called holy, becauſe they are *in the external adminiſtration* of the covenant of grace, any more to the purpoſe: for they cannot have greater opportunities of religious improvement, than their unbelieving parent. If, therefore, they be intitled to baptiſm, on *that* ground, ſo muſt the unconverted parent; and ſo muſt the children of all nominal Chriſtians, who enjoy the external means of ſpiritual knowledge.—Neither have we any reaſon to think, that the children of believers are denominated holy, in reference to *internal ſanctification*; as VITRINGA ſhews, No 7. But what that excellent author means, when he preſumes that they are ſanctified by the Spirit *in their parents*, I do not underſtand: nor do I ſee the reaſon why he preſumes, that God will afford his grace to them, *rather than* to the children of unbelievers. See No 7. Have they a *promiſe* of this grace? If ſo, I aſk and argue with his learned ſucceſſor VENEMA; "Was it made to *all* the children of believers, or only to *ſome?* The *former* being contrary to experience and without reaſon, is rejected by all. The *latter* is preſſed with very great difficulties. For, firſt, the condition of *all* the children of believers, and the relation they have to their parents, are the ſame. If, therefore, that grace be afforded, in reſpect of the parents, it muſt equally and by right belong to all. Secondly; The promiſes of God, given to parents in regard to their infants, are *general*. We have no reaſon, conſequently, to affirm, that they are under any reſtriction. Thirdly; If you aſſert, that God applies a general promiſe according to his own pleaſure, you ſhould take heed how that can be reconciled with the goodneſs and juſtice of God. Seeing the Moſt Holy is wont to perform his engagements in the moſt liberal manner, I would not

ſay,

ſay, that a promiſe given to infants in general, and not ſuſpended on any condition (for that has no place in regard to infants) is performed by God to very few and fulfilled in the moſt ſparing manner. Fourthly; With what reaſon is it affirmed, I deſire to know, that the promiſe is made only to *ſome?* for it is no where found in Scripture: nor can it be maintained, that there is any impediment in the infants themſelves, by which an application of divine grace ſhould be prevented—What ſome very raſhly affirm, that all who believe in a courſe of time, poſſeſs, from their infancy, the ſeeds of regeneration, I conſider as unworthy of confutation; for, *ſeed of regeneration*, often lying hid in the mind, for a long time, without any effect, is to me *a ſound without ſenſe*, and *merely vain words*. For what is meant by the ſeed of regeneration, but *a habit of doing well?* Or, is there an idle habit in the ſoul, a ſpiritual ſubſtance, lying hid without any act *?"

But were we to admit the great VITRINGA's preſumptions, as facts; yet, while poſitive appointments are under the direction of *poſitive laws*, it would not follow that ſuch children ſhould be baptized; unleſs it were proved, that Jeſus Chriſt commanded, or that the Apoſtles practiſed, Infant baptiſm. For as all ritual worſhip depends on the ſovereign will of God, ſo it muſt be intirely governed by a revelation of that will. See CHAPTER I. Thus, for inſtance, when Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham, the ſign of it was peculiar to the males, though his female poſterity were equally intereſted in the bleſſings of that benign conſtitution. Nor were his male deſcendents to be circumciſed till the eighth day, though in the covenant from

* *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. iii. C. i. § 6. 9.

the hour of their birth; neither danger of death, nor any other ſuppoſed neceſſity, could warrant the performance of circumciſion before that appointed time. And though Lot was cotemporary with Abraham, nearly related to him, and in the covenant of grace, when God entered into that federal tranſaction with the renouned Hebrew; yet, as he did not ſpring from the great Patriarch's loins, nor was of his houſehold, neither he, nor any of his poſterity, as ſuch, had a title to circumciſion. Now baptiſm being an inſtitution *intirely poſitive*, as much as circumciſion, it muſt be equally under the controul of *poſitive precepts:* and, conſequently, the ſtrongeſt evidence that infants, of any deſcription, are *in* the covenant of grace, or that they are *holy*, in any ſenſe you pleaſe; is no warrant for baptizing thoſe infants, independent of a divine precept, or an apoſtolic precedent. Beſides, whatever idea our Brethren affix to the term *holy*; whether they conſider what is meant by it, as an *internal* and *perſonal* quality, or as an *external* and *relative* thing; ſeeing *baptiſm* is not mentioned, any more than the *Lord's ſupper*; if the holineſs intended infer a claim on the *former*, it muſt do ſo in regard to the *latter*. Of this Lord BROOKE ſeems to have been ſuſpicious, as appears by No 8; and Mr. PEIRCE roundly aſſerts it, pleading for Infant communion on that very foundation, as the Reader may ſee in CHAPTER XII. No. 13.

REFLECT. V. Whatever difficulty may attend the right interpretation of certain terms, as here uſed; the preceding Reflections, I humbly conceive, ſufficiently ſhew, that our Brethren have no reaſon to boaſt of this text as a ſolid foundation for their practice: becauſe, be the true meaning of the words, *unclean*, *ſanctified*, and *holy*, what it may, none

none of them can be ſo underſtood, conſiſtently with the genius of the New Covenant and the ſcope of the place, as to warrant Infant baptiſm. It cannot, I think, be doubted, but each of theſe expreſſions muſt be underſtood, either in a *ceremonial*, a *moral*, or a *civil* acceptation. Not the *firſt*; for it would reſtore the legal impurity and the legal ſanctity of the Old, the abrogated OEconomy. *The unbelieving huſband is* SANCTIFIED TO *the wife* *; but, ſurely, not as the ancient prieſts were ſanctified, for the ſolemn ſervice of Jehovah. The children are not *unclean*: but, certainly, the pollution which is here denied is not of a *ritual* kind, or like that of an Iſraelitiſh leper, nor yet that of an uncircumciſed Gentile, under the Moſaic Diſpenſation. For a viſion and a voice from heaven required long ago, that no one, whether infant or adult, ſhould be called or treated as, in that ſenſe, *unclean*. Acts x. The children are *holy*: but not as the ſons of Jacob, when free from legal contamination; or as a child, whoſe parents, under the Sinai covenant, were both deſcended from Abraham. For that would replace the carnal prerogatives of Judaiſm, and confound the two very different OEconomies. Yet on this miſtake the argument for Pædobaptiſm, from the paſſage before us, generally proceeds. Thus, for inſtance, Dr. DODDRIDGE: "Nothing can be more apparent than that the word *holy*, ſignifies *perſons* who might be admitted to partake of the diſtinguiſhing rites of God's people.

* So Dr. DODDRIDGE and others render the particle εν; and I think more properly in this paſſage than in our common verſion. So the prepoſition is tranſlated in the very next verſe; as alſo in Luke i. 17. 1 Theſſ. iv. 7. and ſix or ſeven times over in 2 Pet. i. 5, 6, 7.

ple. Compare Exod. xix. 6. and ſo on *." Granted, in reference to the former Diſpenſation; but what then? Does it follow, that God has made an external covenant with *all Chriſtians*, as he did *with all the Jewiſh nation*, when convened at Horeb? Are all who profeſs Chriſtianity *holy*, in the ſame ſenſe that all Iſrael were holy, at that memorable period? Or, is it apparent, that all who acknowledge Jeſus for the true Meſſiah, have an equal title to the poſitive inſtitutions of the Goſpel church, with all the ancient Iſraelites, to the diſtinguiſhing rites of Judaiſm? The bulk of the latter were manifeſtly carnal and ungodly; yet, while free from ritual impurity, they had as good a claim on thoſe rites as Moſes himſelf: but, if legally polluted, the fervent piety of an Elijah would not have warranted their participation of them. Now, is any thing like this in force, under the Evangelical OEconomy?—Beſides, if Dr. DODDRIDGE's argument prove any thing in ſupport of Infant baptiſm, it will equally evince the right of infants to the ſacred ſupper. For if, becauſe the epithet *holy* is here applied to children, we muſt immediately recur to the ceremonial purity of ancient ages; and thence infer, that, as "the word *holy* ſignifies perſons who might be admitted to partake of the *diſtinguiſhing rites* of God's people," under the former Diſpenſation; ſo the infants of believing parents are now to be baptized; it will unavoidably follow, that the ſame infants have a claim on the Lord's ſupper. This Mr. PEIRCE has unanſwerably proved, is the neceſſary conſequence of the Doctor's principle; as the Reader may ſee, CHAPTER XII. For the holy ſupper is no leſs a *diſtinguiſhing rite* of Chriſtianity, than baptiſm; or than the ordinance of circumciſion, or the

* *Note* on the place.

the paſchal feaſt, of Judaiſm. Hence, I think, it appears, that the terms under conſideration ſhould not be underſtood in a *ritual* ſenſe; that being abhorrent from the Chriſtian OEconomy. Let us review them, therefore, under a *moral* acceptation.

The unbelieving huſband hath been ſanctified to the wife, ſays the Oracle of heaven. If the word *ſanctified* mean a *moral* act, or operation, what is it? Something performed *for* him, or ſomething wrought *in* him? If the *former*, it ſeems to be no other than the work of the believing wife recommending him to God by ſolemn prayer, and uſing her beſt endeavours for his converſion. This, undoubtedly, is a moral duty; yet not peculiar to a believing wife, or a believing huſband, on the behalf of an unconverted partner. No; it is incumbent on parents, for the good of their children; on maſters, in regard to their ſervants; and on every believer, in reſpect of his unconverted neighbour. For it is a branch of that law, *Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf*. But the Apoſtle is here ſpeaking of ſomething which is peculiar to thoſe that are in the *conjugal* ſtate: nor have I obſerved, in the courſe of my reading, any Pædobaptiſt author who underſtands the ſanctification here intended, as common to any deſcription of perſons not in that relation. Beſides, to ſeek the bleſſing of God on an unconverted companion, is the work of *every day*; but the inſpired Writer ſpeaks in the preter perfect tenſe, ηγιασται, *hath been ſanctified*; expreſſing an act *completely paſt*.—On the other hand, if it be ſomething wrought *in* him, what can it be but *real holineſs?* That, however, is out of the queſtion, in this caſe; becauſe the perſon ſanctified is yet an unbeliever—a Jewiſh bigot, or a Pagan idolater. The tempers of his heart and the courſe of his life, therefore, are far from bearing the genuine

genuine marks of real ſanctity.—The children are *not unclean*—they *are holy*. But this freedom from impurity, this holineſs, is a fruit of the forementioned ſanctification, and therefore muſt be of the ſame nature. Conſequently, *that* not being of a moral kind, neither can *this*. Beſides, if ſuch children be holy in a moral ſenſe, it cannot be by any prerogative of *birth*; for they *are, by nature, the children of wrath, even as others*. It muſt, therefore, be in virtue of a Divine agency, or a Divine deſtination. But of ſuch an influence producing holineſs, or ſuch an appointment to the enjoyment of it, there is no evidence while in their infant ſtate: and if there were, either they muſt all be finally ſaved, though dying under the ſtrongeſt marks of impenitency; or the immutability of Jehovah's purpoſe, and the doctrine of perſeverance, muſt fall to the ground. As, then, the *moral* ſenſe of theſe terms is not here admiſſible, we muſt look out for another acceptation.

The unbelieving huſband hath been ſanctified to the wife. The children are not *unclean*—they are *holy*. The *ritual* and *moral* ſignification of theſe words being diſcarded, what remains, but that we conſider them, in this paſſage, as expreſſing facts of a *civil* nature? And though this interpretation ſhould be attended with ſome difficulties, yet they may not, perhaps, be equal to thoſe which embarraſs that of our Brethren: for they will not ariſe from the *ſpiritual nature* of the New Covenant, which is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the *ceremonial* acceptation of theſe words; nor from our interpretation being contrary to *plain facts*, or foreign to the *occaſion* and *ſcope* of the text, as the *moral* meaning of theſe expreſſions appears to be. This, I think, will be manifeſt, if the following things be duly regarded.

The

The deſign of Paul was to evince, that ſuch Chriſtian converts as were married to unbelievers, ſhould reject every thought of a ſeparation on account of the Chriſtian faith; becauſe that faith was far from diſſolving the matrimonial bond, and equally far from rendering their cohabitation unlawful. For it ſeems, that a doubt of this kind was entertained by ſome who were members of the church at Corinth. But with what appearance of reaſon ſuch a query could have ariſen, if it had been uſual in thoſe times to baptize the infants of parents in this predicament, we leave our oppoſers to ſhew. As there is ground to conclude, that it was no uncommon thing for a huſband, or a wife, to embrace the glorious goſpel, while his, or her, partner in life continued averſe to it; the very doubt which Paul reſolves, affords a ſtrong preſumptive argument, that it was not the cuſtom for apoſtolic miniſters to baptize children; ſuch, at leaſt, whoſe parents were not both converted. For, had that been a prevailing practice, there would not have been the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon in the painful query; becauſe, on the principles adopted by many of our oppoſers, a practice of that kind, would have been an open avowal of ſuch a marriage as valid, and as obliging to all the tender duties of the conjugal ſtate. Whereas, if Infant baptiſm was then unknown, it is not at all ſtrange, that ſuch a ſcruple ſhould have ariſen in the minds of thoſe who conſidered the contrariety which there is between Chriſtianity and Paganiſm; and eſpecially, if they adverted to that obligation under which the Jews had formerly been, to put away their Heatheniſh wives.—Now, to rectify this miſtake, which had ſo baneful an aſpect on domeſtic happineſs, the Apoſtle obſerves, that *the unbelieving huſband had been* ſanctified *to the wife*; and

and that *the unbelieving wife had been* ſanctified *to the huſband.* On this term *ſanctified*, the inſpired Writer manifeſtly lays a peculiar emphaſis; *ſuch* an emphaſis, that it ſeems to be the governing word of the whole ſentence, and a key to its true meaning. For it is twice mentioned as containing the *grand reaſon*, why the believing party ſhould neither deſert, nor divorce, the unconverted companion; and alſo, as expreſſing *the ground* of that holineſs which is aſcribed to their children. By what, then, were the perſons concerned *ſanctified* one to another? By the *faith*, or *prayers*, of the believing party? Something different from theſe muſt be intended by the expreſſive word; ſomething which rendered it lawful to *cohabit*, as huſband and wife, and utterly prohibited a ſeparation: but ſuch was not the reſult of merely devotional diſpoſitions, or acts of piety. Beſides, as the Apoſtle, in Verſe the thirty-ninth, expreſſly puts in a *caveat* againſt the conjugal connection commencing between a converted and an unconverted perſon; ſo, in this text, he leads us to conſider the married pair of whom he ſpeaks, as being ſanctified *before* either of them was a believer: which the Reader ſhould by no means overlook. What, then, could it be, that ſanctified them one to another, but the public and voluntary act of taking the woman, for a wife, and the man, for a huſband? By this tranſaction, according to the legal cuſtom of their country, they mutually *gave up*, or *ſet apart*, themſelves one to another. Now, the perſon of each having been thus devoted to the other, while both were unconverted; and no poſitive divine law being tranſgreſſed by that reciprocal engagement, its obligation muſt be laſting. For, as a ſervant is not releaſed from his maſter, by commencing

commencing a believer; ſo, a huſband, or a wife, is not freed from the duties of marriage, by becoming a Chriſtian: and, therefore, it is not lawful for a believing wife to depart from her huſband, nor for the converted huſband to put away his wife.—This reaſoning is further inforced by the Apoſtle, when he adds, *Elſe were your children* unclean, *but now are they* holy. If the term *ſanctified*, expreſs that which conſtituted the parents huſband and wife, as appears from what has been ſaid; and if that word have any influence on the ſenſe of this clauſe, as it manifeſtly has; the terms, *unclean*, and *holy*, muſt ſignify *ſpurious*, and *legitimate*. Had not the unbelieving huſband been *ſo* ſanctified to the wife, as to conſtitute a real marriage relation, there would have been reaſon for her to ſcruple the lawfulneſs of cohabitation; for their offſpring would have been *ſpurious*. As he *was* ſo ſanctified to her, ſhe had no ground to queſtion the chaſtity of her connection; for the very nature of it ſhews, that her children are *legitimate*.

This, if I miſtake not, intirely obviates an objection of Dr. DODDRIDGE againſt the ſenſe that is here given. He, when pleading for a kind of ritual ſenſe in the word *holy*, and oppoſing the idea of *legitimacy*, as intended by it, obſerves; "Nothing can be more evident, than that the argument will by no means bear it; for it would be proving a thing by itſelf, *idem per idem*, to argue that the converſe of the parents is lawful becauſe the children were not *baſtards*; whereas all who thought the converſe of the parents unlawful, muſt of courſe think that the children were *illegitimate**." But this repreſentation is quite a miſtake. For, according to the interpretation here adopted, the argument

* *Note*, on the place.

ment runs thus; The children are *legitimate*, becauſe the converſe of the parents is *lawful:* and that converſe is lawful, becauſe they have been *ſanctified*, or eſpouſed, one to another.—Nor are the ideas of *ſpurious* and *legitimate*, which this interpretation affixes to the terms, ακαθαρτα and ἁγια, more foreign to the language of inſpiration, when delivering the promiſes, doctrines, and laws, of the *preſent* OEconomy, than thoſe which Dr. DODDRIDGE himſelf annexes to them: for we may venture to affirm, that theſe expreſſions are *never* uſed in thoſe laws, doctrines, and promiſes, to denote a *ritual* uncleanneſs, or a *legal* purity; becauſe no ſuch diſtinction between one perſon and another now exiſts. But we do find, that the word *uncleanneſs* is uſed to ſignify an *illicit commerce* between the ſexes; and therefore we need not wonder if the iſſue of ſuch an intercourſe be here intimated by the term, *unclean*. And as it is equally clear, that this very Apoſtle directly oppoſes ἁγιασμος to πορνεια, and ἁγιασμω to ακαθαρσια, 1 Theſſ. iv. 3, 4, 7. it is not at all extraordinary if ἁγια, in the paſſage before us, mean *legitimate**, and ακαθαρτα ſignify *ſpurious*. And ſo SCHWARZ, in his excellent Lexicon to the Greek Teſtament, interprets the word as here uſed †. —Againſt this view of the text it is alſo objected; "That the validity of the marriage in queſtion, did not depend on either party being a converted perſon." This we readily grant; nor does our ſenſe of the paſſage involve ſuch an abſurdity: for it proceeds on the repeated and emphatical uſe of the term *ſanctified*, as here applied to the unbeliever; nor does it at all depend on one of them being *converted*. The Apoſtle, indeed, mentions that particular;

* Vid. SCHOETTGENIUM, *Hor. Heb.* ad 1 Theſſ. iv. 3, 4. † Sub voce, Ἅγιος.

cular; and there was reaſon for it. Becauſe the *believer only* could entertain a doubt, concerning the lawfulneſs of cohabiting with an unbeliever: but the force of Paul's reaſoning, and the propriety of our interpretation, chiefly depend, on the unconverted party having been SANCTIFIED *to the believer.*

The Baptiſts are often repreſented by their oppoſers, as if they were the *only* perſons who adopt this interpretation of the paſſage, and as if they were obliged to it by mere hypotheſis: but that they are not the *only* perſons who ſo underſtand the words, appears from the Authors produced; to whom I might have added, ERASMUS, and ERAS. SCHMIDIUS. And that the Baptiſts have no need of ſubterfuge, to evade the force of any argument formed upon it, is plain, I humbly conceive, from the preceding Reflections. No, while they have both precept and example on their ſide; and while they remember that the affair in diſpute, is a *poſitive* inſtitution; they muſt be either very timid, or extremely weak, if they entertain apprehenſions of danger to their cauſe, from any part of the ſacred Records where baptiſm is not ſo much as *mentioned*, and where a ſubject *very different* is under diſcuſſion; both which are manifeſtly the caſe here. They are, indeed, ſo far from being under any alarm for the ſafety of their hypotheſis, from any evidence afforded againſt them by this text; that they cannot forbear wondering, ſo many learned, and wiſe, and godly Pædobaptiſts, ſhould lay ſuch a ſtreſs upon it as they do. And, when the Baptiſts find it alleged with an air of ſupercilious confidence, as if it were *expreſſly* in favour of Pædobaptiſm; they cannot but reflect on a ſpirited reply of the famous Mr. POOLE, in oppoſition to CRESSY, a Roman Catholic writer. CRESSY, when defending

ing

ing the Papal infallibility, expreſſed himſelf with an exalted tone of aſſurance in the following manner. "This doctrine of the church's infallibility, is the *moſt expreſs* in Scripture." On this Mr. POOLE remarks; "I ſuppoſe he told us ſo upon the ſame account that the old painter wrote under his picture, *This is a* LION; for fear ſome ſhould have miſtaken it for a *bull**."

When I was juſt going to congratulate my Baptiſt Brethren, on the perfect conſiſtency of Scripture with our diſtinguiſhing ſentiment and practice; Dr. JOHN EDWARDS came in my way, and utterly forbade ſuch a procedure. Yes, that learned author ſeverely checked my pleaſing emotions reſulting from thoſe interpretations which Pædobaptiſts themſelves have given of the ſeveral texts produced againſt us; by inſiſting, that there is another paſſage of holy Writ, which, though much overlooked, is *quite deciſive* againſt us. When diſcourſing—but who could have thought of meeting with ſuch a rebuff, by a comment on ſuch a text!—when diſcourſing on thoſe words, Cant. vii. 2. *Thy navel is like a round goblet which wanteth not liquor*; and when conſidering the paſſage as relating to baptiſm, he ſays; "Here is a great controverſy *ſolved*, namely, between us and the Anabaptiſts, who are againſt the baptizing of children, becauſe they are not come to the years of underſtanding. Let it be remembered, from what is ſuggeſted to us here, that infants (according to the notion which prevailed in thoſe days) receive nouriſhment by the *navel*, though they take not in any food by the mouth—So it is no good objection againſt baptizing infants, that they are ignorant and underſtand not what they do, and that they are not able to take in ſpiritual nouriſhment after

* *Appendix to Nullity of Romiſh Faith*, p. 25.

after the ordinary way: it may be done, as it is ſaid here, by the *navel*, by that federal knot, or link, which ties them faſt to their Chriſtian and believing parents*."—And now, my Baptiſt Brethren, is not this *demonſtration*, and bright as the ſun? What can we ſay, or what but incorrigibility itſelf can withſtand it? Becauſe, though Moſes, when writing his Pentateuch, and though Ezekiel, when penning his prophecies, had no thought about Infant baptiſm; nay, though the Apoſtles themſelves have ſaid nothing of it; yet, while it appears that Solomon had ſuch a *clear* diſcernment of it, when recording his inſpired Song, we can only cry out with the alarmed ſervant of an ancient prophet; *Alas, maſter, how ſhall we do!* For though, by the friendly aſſiſtance of Pædobaptiſts, we have parried the thruſt of our adverſaries from other texts; yet this unexpected attack affects us in ſuch a manner, that we have no inclination to make a defence, or to look out for auxiliaries. We ſhall, therefore, only juſt mention an obſervation of Dr. BARROW, relating to the Papal ſupremacy and the Roman Catholics. "They have indeed, ſays he, found the Pope in the *firſt* Chapter of Geneſis: for if we believe Pope INNOCENT III. he is one of the two great *luminaries* there; and he is as plainly *there*, as any where elſe in the Bible†."

* *Exercitations, Crit. Philoſoph.* Exercit. IX. p. 136, 137.

† *On the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 155.

SECT.

SECTION V.

Apoſtolic Tradition, and the Impracticability of pointing out the Time when Pædobaptiſm commenced.

J. A. TURRETTINUS: "*Tradition* is a convenient word, to excuſe and retain thoſe things that were brought into religion without the authority of Scripture, by the ignorance of the times and the tyranny of men." *Cogitat. et Diſſertat.* Tom I. p. 44.

2. Bp. BURNET: "To convince the world how early tradition might either vary, or miſrepreſent matters; let the tradition not only in, but *before* St. IRENÆUS's time, concerning the obſervation of Eaſter, be conſidered, which goes up as high as St. POLYCARP's time—If, then, tradition failed ſo near its fountain, we may eaſily judge what account we ought to make of it at ſo great a diſtance." *Four Diſcourſ. to the Clergy*, p. 247, 248.

3. Mr. ROBINSON: "If—whatever we find to have been a general and prevailing cuſtom, a few hundred years after the Apoſtles, muſt neceſſarily be allowed to have been the practice of their times too; I am afraid, we muſt not only have *forms* of prayer, but alſo prayers *for the dead*, and *invocations* of ſaints and angels, and ſo on." *Review of the Caſe of Liturg.* p. 111.

4. Mr. POOLE: "That the Fathers were oft-times deceived in the point of traditions, and in matters of fact, is acknowledged by ſeveral of the moſt learned Papiſts; and BARONIUS gives us diverſe examples of their miſtakes, in ſundry parts of his

his Annals, and that too among the *firſt* Fathers; who had far greater opportunities to know the truth than their followers, and greater integrity to deliver nothing contrary to their knowledge, and much more miſtakes there might be committed by thoſe that came after them." *Nullity of Romiſh Faith*, p. 66, 67.

5. ANONYMOUS: "The Church of Rome—will not acknowledge their points of doctrine to be erroneous, unleſs we can aſſign the *time*, and point out the *perſons*, who firſt broached them—If a man be ſick of a conſumption, will he refuſe help of the phyſician, except he can reſolve him whether his lungs or his liver were firſt infected, and ſhew the time when, and the occaſion how, his body grew firſt diſtempered?" *Popery Confuted by Papiſts*, p. 26, 27. Edit. 2d.

6. Bp. TAYLOR: "The Fathers were infinitely deceived in their account and enumeration of traditions: ſometimes they did call ſome traditions, ſuch, not which they *knew* to be ſo, but by *arguments* and *preſumptions* they concluded them ſo. Such as was that of St. AUSTIN; *Thoſe things which the univerſal church holds, that are not found appointed by Councils, deſcended, it is credible, by tradition from the Apoſtles*—CLEMENS of Alexandria, pretended it a tradition that the Apoſtles preached to them that died in infidelity, even after their death, and then raiſed them to life—He affirmed it to be a tradition apoſtolical, that the Greeks were ſaved by their philoſophy — TERTULLIAN and S. BASIL pretend it an apoſtolical tradition, to ſign in the air with the ſign of the croſs—There are yet ſome points of good concernment, which, if any man ſhould queſtion in a high manner, would prove undeterminable by Scripture, or ſufficient reaſon; and yet, I doubt not, their confident defenders

fenders would ſay, they are opinions of the church, and quickly pretend a tradition from the very Apoſtles, and believe themſelves ſo ſecure that they could not be diſcovered; becauſe the queſtion never having been diſputed, gives them occaſion to ſay, *That which had no beginning known, was certainly from the Apoſtles*—The *baptiſm of infants* is called a tradition by ORIGEN * *alone*, at firſt; and from him, by others—It is ſaid to be a tradition apoſtolical, that no prieſt ſhould baptize without *chriſm*, and the command of the biſhop—There is no pretence of tradition, that the church in *all* ages did baptize *all* the infants of Chriſtian parents. It is more certain that they did *not* do it always, than that they did it in the *firſt* age. St. AMBROSE, St. HIEROM, and St. AUSTIN, were born of Chriſtian parents, and yet not baptized until the full age of a man, and more—That it was the cuſtom ſo to do in ſome churches, and at ſome times, is without all queſtion; but that there is a tradition from the Apoſtles ſo to do, relies but on *two* witneſſes, ORIGEN and AUSTIN: and the *latter* having received it from the *former*, it relies wholly on *one ſingle* teſtimony; which is but a *pitiful argument* to prove a tradition apoſtolical. He is the firſt that ſpoke it: but TERTULLIAN, that was before him, ſeems to ſpeak againſt it; which he would *not* have done, if it had been a tradition apoſtolical. And that it was not ſo, is but too certain, if there be any truth in the words of LUDOVICUS VIVES." *Liberty of Propheſying*, Sect. V. p. 84, 89, 90, 93, 94. *Diſſuaſive from Popery*, Part II. Lib. II. Sect. III. p. 117, 118. The *latter* of theſe, in Dr. WALL's *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. II. § 10.

7. HOSPI-

* This has been already proved to be a miſtake. See CHAP. IX. REFLECT. IV.

7. HOSPINIANUS: "In the time of AUSTIN it was commonly believed, that whatever was received by the church, as a devotional cuſtom, proceeded from *apoſtolic tradition* and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit—Not all things which the Ancients propoſe under the title of apoſtolic tradition, are to be immediately received as ſuch." *Hiſt. Sacram.* L. II. p 41. L. V. p. 424.

8. Mr. HENRY: "IRENÆUS, one of the firſt Fathers, with this paſſage, [Joh. viii. 57.] ſupports the tradition, which he ſaith he had from ſome that had converſed with St. John, that our Saviour lived to be *fifty* years old, which he contends for. *See what little credit is to be given to tradition!*" *Expoſition*, on Joh. viii. 57.

9. TURRETTINUS: "But you will ſay; If any alterations have taken place in the Church of Rome, ſince the apoſtolic age, the time *when*, and the perſons *by whom* they were made, ſhould be pointed out. But no reaſon obliges us to this. As if—— various alterations did not frequently occur to our notice, of which, neither the *time*, nor the *place*, nor the *firſt authors*, can be accurately known—It is difficult, if not impoſſible, to mark the firſt moments in which any corruption began, though the fact be ſo manifeſt that it cannot be denied. But what neceſſity is there, to point out either the *authors*, or the *times*, provided the facts be certain? In order to prove that you have the plague,——is it neceſſary for me to ſhew, in what *moment* the deſtructive diſeaſe began to rage? Is it not quite ſufficient, by undoubted arguments, to prove, that you labour under the fatal malady? And would not he deſerve contempt, who ſhould think rather about the *commencement* of the diſeaſe, than concerning an *effectual remedy*, that ſhould be uſed for his recovery?

covery?——Though the preciſe time of ſuch corruptions commencing, cannot be exactly ſhewed; it does not therefore follow, that there *are none*; or that they are by us falſely attributed to the Church of Rome. For the queſtion is not, WHEN *were ſuch corruptions introduced?* but, *Whether, in reality, there* BE SUCH? which may be learnt, not from the monuments of ancient hiſtory, but from a conſideration of its preſent ſtate. Agreeable to this, was our Lord's manner of acting, when he reproved the Scribes and Phariſees. Did he particularize either the *authors*, or *places*, or *times* in which ſuch or ſuch errors were brought into the church? Nothing leſs. Yet no one could have performed it better than He, who knew moſt accurately the commencement of every alteration. Satisfied with the Scripture only, he appeals to the firſt beginning: *From the beginning it was not ſo*, Mat. xix. 8. Or, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures*, Mat. xxii. 29. Why, then, ſhould we be tied to ſuch a ſcrupulous deſignation of time, and of other circumſtances, that make nothing to the purpoſe? when it is quite ſufficient for us to ſhew, That the doctrine of the Apoſtles differs exceedingly from that which prevails in the Papacy; and that the preſent Roman church, differs much from that in the apoſtolic age; and, therefore, *from the beginning it was not ſo.*" *De Neceſſ. Seceſſ. ab Eccleſ. Rom.* Diſput. V. § 10. See alſo his *Inſtitut. Theolog.* Tom. III. Loc. XVIII. Quæſt. XIII. § 13—19. and Dr. DODDRIDGE's *Note*, on Acts xxii. 3.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. The Baptiſts are here informed by their learned opponents, That the pretence of

of tradition is a happy expedient, in favour of thoſe who wiſh to retain unſcriptural rites in the worſhip of God. See No 1—That ſome of the firſt Fathers, who pleaded apoſtolic tradition, ſtand convicted of error. See No 2. 4. 6. 8—That were an eccleſiaſtical cuſtom, but a few centuries after the Chriſtian æra commenced, to be conſidered as an apoſtolical practice, barely on a traditional ground; we muſt adopt a variety of ceremonies, which all Proteſtants have agreed to reject. See No 3. 6—That the conduct of Roman Catholics, in refuſing to acknowledge their errors, except the time when and the perſons by whom they were introduced be pointed out, is groſſly abſurd. See No 5. 9.—And, that there is no pretence of tradition, relating to all the infants of Chriſtian parents being baptized in the early ages of the church; but, that the contrary is manifeſt. See No 6. Such are the ſentiments of theſe reſpectable authors, concerning the matter before us.

REFLECT. II. Though the preceding quotations are but as the tythe to the whole crop, if compared with what might be produced from learned Proteſtants when diſputing with Papiſts, as all who are verſed in that controverſy muſt be aware; yet they are quite ſufficient, on this occaſion, both by way of authority, and in point of argument. For if this method of reaſoning againſt the comparative novelties of Popery be concluſive, as every conſiſtent Proteſtant will readily grant; it muſt equally affect the argument for Infant baptiſm, ſo far as tradition, detached from Scripture, is pleaded for it: becauſe theſe learned writers warrant us to aſſert, that if all the Fathers, from POLYCARP to AUSTIN, had agreed in pronouncing Pædobaptiſm an *apoſtolic tradition*, which is far from being the caſe; the evi-

dence

dence of its divine authority would ſtill have been precarious, notwithſtanding the hoary antiquity of ſuch a plea in its favour.—As errors in doctrine and corruptions of worſhip were multiplied in the ſecond and third Centuries; as, in every ſucceeding age, for a long courſe of time, the fertile invention of eccleſiaſtics deviſed ſomething new, in addition to former depravations of truth, of worſhip, and of church order; as books were forged under the venerable names of primitive Fathers; and as apoſtolic tradition was pleaded to ſanctify a great number of novelties; we are bound to conſider all arguments from tradition as futile, except ſo far as they derive any force from correſponding evidence in the apoſtolic page. "For, as Bp. TAYLOR obſerves, no church, at this day, admits the *one half* of thoſe things, which certainly by the Fathers were called *traditions apoſtolical**."

That the ſubjects of the triple crown ſhould be fond of tradition, we have no reaſon to wonder; becauſe it not only agrees with their avowed principles, but is, in many caſes, almoſt their only reſource. Hence we find SALMERON, who was a veteran in the cauſe of ſuperſtition, boldly aſſerting, that "gainſayers can never be convinced out of the Scripture; therefore, ſays he, you muſt confound them with tradition †." But that *Proteſtants* ſhould have recourſe to a ſimilar practice, on any occaſion where *poſitive* divine law is concerned, is a diſgrace to that firſt principle of the Reformation, THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE. Nor can it, indeed, be ſuppoſed, that any of the Reformed ſhould ſolicit the friendly aid of tradition, in ſupport of religious practice,

* *Liberty of Propheſying*, Sect. V. p. 96.

† In Mr. POOLES's *Nullity of Romiſh Faith*, p. 218.

practice, if they did not *feel* their want of direct evidence in the ſacred Writings. What is the reaſon, for inſtance, that our Engliſh Epiſcopalians make ſuch loud appeals to ancient eccleſiaſtical writers, in defence of their hierarchy, and various other things in the National Eſtabliſhment, but a conſciouſneſs that the orders and laws of Chriſt in the New Teſtament do not extend their divine ſanction to thoſe particulars? What is the reaſon of Proteſtant Pædobaptiſts in general, laying ſo much ſtreſs on proſelyte baptiſm, Jewiſh circumciſion, and eccleſiaſtical tradition, in favour of Infant baptiſm, but a painful conviction that the New Teſtament is not explicit enough in proof of their point? And what beſides can induce any of them, to conſider and practiſe Infant baptiſm, as a *traditional rite*, rather than under the notion of a *divine command?* CURCELLÆUS, for inſtance, expreſſes himſelf to this effect. "Pædobaptiſm was *unknown* in the two firſt ages after Chriſt;—and therefore this rite is indeed obſerved by us, as an *ancient cuſtom*, but not as an *apoſtolic* tradition*." Thus Mr. BRANDT: "That good and very *ancient cuſtom* of baptizing infants, is advanced with too much violence by ſome, and oppoſed with no leſs by others. This ceremony, as ſome think, prevailed firſt in Africa and Greece; but in ſuch a manner that ſome doctors of the church openly declared, that they could not conſent to it†." Thus alſo Mr. DANIEL ROGERS: "I take the baptiſm of infants to be one of the moſt reverend, general, and uncontrouled *traditions* which the church hath, and which I would no leſs doubt of than the Creed to be apoſtolical; although

* In Dr. GILL's *Argument from Apoſtolic Tradition*, p. 8.

† *Hiſt. of Reform.* Annotat. on B. II. p. 8.

his cauſe, partly on *apoſtolic tradition*; while, when pleading the cauſe of Nonconformity, he rejects that very tradition with contempt? This, as a writer in one of our periodical publications obſerves, is to "make evidence *ſhift ſides*, by turns, juſt as it happens to favour or to thwart our cauſe*." Mr. TOWGOOD, when ably maintaining, that the Scripture is a ſufficient and perfect rule in matters of religion; and when animadverting on the conduct of our Epiſcopalian authors, in their diſputes with Proteſtant Nonconformiſts, and with Papiſts; has the following remark, which, *mutatis mutandis*, may be applied to the caſe before us. "'Tis really pleaſant to obſerve, how, in their attacks upon Diſſenters, *Councils* and *Fathers*——are gravely muſtered up, and plied warmly upon us. But no ſooner does a crafty *Jeſuit* come forth armed, *cap-a-pee*, with weapons of this kind, than away they are all flung! to *our* quarters they retreat! Then, the BIBLE, *the* BIBLE *only is the religion of Proteſtants* †." What can be the reaſon of a conduct ſo inconſiſtent, except it be that which is mentioned by Mr. CHAMBERS, in a paſſage already produced? That learned philoſopher, when ſpeaking of the German Baptiſts, and of their argument from the words of our Lord, in Mark xvi. 16. informs us; That "Calvin and other writers againſt them, are *pretty much embarraſſed* to anſwer this argument, and *are* OBLIGED *to have recourſe to* TRADITION *and the practice of the primitive church* ‡."—Pædobaptiſm, ſays Mr. TOWGOOD, is "FOUNDED upon Scripture, and undoubted apoſtolical tradition." Then its foundation is like the heterogeneous feet of Nebuchadnezzar's

* *Monthly Review*, for Sep. 1783, p. 220.

† *Diſſent. Gent. Letters*, Lett. III. p. 119.

‡ *Cyclopædia*, Article, ANABAPTISTS.

nezzar's image; partly *iron*, and partly *clay*. Rather, like that of ſome huge Coloſſus, which has one foot on a *mountain of braſs*; the other, on the *foam of the water*. Divine Revelation is as the *former*; apoſtolic tradition is as the *latter:* for the learned HENRY ALTING has juſtly denied the very *exiſtence* of ſuch a tradition, further than it is contained in the New Teſtament*.—"FOUNDED upon Scripture, and undoubted apoſtolical tradition." Marvellous language this, from the pen of a Proteſtant Diſſenter! Much more becoming the creed of a high-flying Churchman, or of a zealous Papiſt, when defending the uſe of *ſponſors*, the *ſign of the croſs*, the *conſecration of water*, and ſo on; than the principles of a Proteſtant Nonconformiſt. Yet ſo it is, and ſo it is likely to be, while Pædobaptiſm is defended by any of our Diſſenting Brethren.

REFLECT. III. What is remarked, No 5. 9. concerning the abſurdity of Roman Catholics, in refuſing to acknowledge their errors, till the time *when*, and the perſons *by whom*, they were introduced are expoſed to view; will equally apply to Infant baptiſm, if it be not contained in Scripture. To which we may add, that our Epiſcopalian authors, when defending a *ſubordination* of church officers, in honour of their parliamentary Eſtabliſhment, can plead the ſilence of antiquity, as to the time when that ſubordination *firſt* commenced. And what have Preſbyterians, or the Proteſtant Diſſenters, here to reply in their own defence? Are they not obliged to confeſs their ignorance of the preciſe *time* and *occaſion* of its firſt having place in the church, and to reſt in this; The New Teſtament knows nothing of that ſubordination for which

* *Loci Commun.* Pars II. p. 287.

Epiſcopalians plead; and, therefore, *from the beginning it was not ſo?* Thus Dr. OWEN: It is not "agreed, nor as far as I ſee, will it ever be agreed among learned men, when firſt a *diſparity* among the ordinary officers of the church, in order, degree, or power, did firſt begin; nor by what means it was brought about*." STAPFERUS likewiſe, a learned foreigner, having obſerved, that the biſhops and preſbyters of the new Teſtament, differ only in reſpect of their *names*, immediately adds; "But from this appointment men departed by little and little, when firſt a diſtinction was made between biſhops and preſbyters: although it *is uncertain when this new inſtitution began to be introduced into the church* †."—Till, therefore, it be fairly proved, that Infant baptiſm is warranted, either by precept or example, in the New Teſtament, we need not be much concerned about the *preciſe time* when it was introduced; but may ſafely ſhelter our cauſe under the wings of that divine oracle: FROM THE BEGINNING IT WAS NOT SO. Beſides, if our opponents will pledge themſelves, to inform us of the preciſe time when *Infant communion* firſt came into the church; we will engage, in our turn, to inform them, with equal preciſion, when *Infant baptiſm* was firſt practiſed. See CHAP. XII. No 8, 9, 10. 12.

* *Enquiry into the Original, Nature, and Inſtitut. of Evangel. Churches*, Pref. p. 23.

† *Inſtitut. Theolog. Polem.* Cap. XIV. § 28, 29.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

INFANT BAPTISM *and* INFANT COMMUNION, *introduced about the ſame Time, and ſupported by ſimilar Arguments.*

BP. BURNET: "We ſee a practice that was *very ancient*, and that continued *very long*, which aroſe out of the expoſition of thoſe words, Joh. vi. 53. by which infants were made partakers of the euchariſt." *Four Diſcourſes to the Clergy*, p. 206, 207.

2. HOSPINIANUS: "The Lord's ſupper was given to the infants of believers, in the time of Pope INNOCENT I. of CYPRIAN, and of AUSTIN; as well in Europe, as in Aſia and Africa, and that as *neceſſary* to ſalvation——JEROM, AUSTIN, and other Fathers teſtify, that they who were baptized, not only adults, but alſo infants, without any delay received the Lord's ſupper in both kinds——This anciently received cuſtom prevailed, afterwards, to ſuch a degree, eſpecially in the time of CHARLES the Great, that the euchariſt was not only given to infants in the public aſſemblies, after the adminiſtration of baptiſm, and at other times when the church uſually met for the celebration of the holy ſupper; but alſo the bread of the ſupper was *reſerved to be given to little children that were ſick*, equally as to adults—Agreeable to that canon; *Let a preſbyter have the euchariſt always ready, that when any perſon is afflicted, or a little child is weakly, he may immediately adminiſter it, leſt he die without the communion*——There were ſome remains of this cuſtom

cuſtom in Lorrain and the parts adjacent, but a few years ago. For there, when an infant was baptized, the prieſt that baptized him,—uſed to dip his fingers in the cup, and drop the wine into the child's mouth, ſaying: *The blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt profit thee to eternal life*——The Ancients, and among them AUSTIN eſpecially, were principally induced to give the ſacred ſupper to infants, by that ſaying of Chriſt, Joh. vi. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* Whence they thought it neceſſary, that infants alſo ſhould be admitted to the Lord's ſupper, by which they might be rendered partakers of Chriſt and of eternal life——And, without doubt, they do rightly who give the euchariſt to infants, if the arguments of the Fathers, of the Papiſts, and of others, be of any weight, by which they tie ſalvation to baptiſm: for they ſee, with equal reaſon, that the ſame bleſſings may follow a participation of the Lord's ſupper. And for that reaſon, thoſe who urged the neceſſity of communicating at the Lord's table, urged an equal neceſſity of being baptized: among whom AUSTIN unwarrantably indulged his own opinion, in reſpect of baptiſm, when writing againſt the Pelagians; too inconſiderately conſigning over the infants of Chriſtians to damnation, that died without being baptized. There is nothing that he more zealouſly urges, or on which he more firmly depends, than thoſe words of Chriſt; *Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*" *Hiſt. Sacram.* L. II. C. II. p. 51. 62.

3. HEIDEGGERUS: "The ancient church, for *a long time*, gave the ſacred ſymbols of the holy ſupper to *infants*; being led to it by a falſe interpretation of our Lord's words, Joh. vi. 53. compared with

with the declaration of the ſame divine Teacher, Joh. iii. 5." *Corpus Theolog. Chriſt.* Tom. II. Loc. XXV. § 75.

4. SALMASIUS: "Becauſe the euchariſt was given to adult Catechumens when they were waſhed with holy baptiſm, without any ſpace of time intervening, this alſo was done to infants, after Pædobaptiſm was introduced." Apud VAN DALE *Diſſertat. de Pædobaptiſmo.* Vid. SUICERI *Theſaur. Eccleſ.* Tom. II. p. 1136.

5. SUICERUS: "It is *notorious*, from antiquity, that the euchariſt was given to infants—This cuſtom, anciently received, afterwards prevailed to ſuch a degree, eſpecially in the time of CHARLES the Great, that the holy ſupper was given to infants, not only in the public aſſembly of the church after baptiſm, or at other times when the church uſed to aſſemble for the holy communion; but ſome of the bread of the ſacred ſupper was reſerved, to be given to ſuch infants as were ſick, as well as to adults. ANSEGISUS, an Abbot of Liege, who recites a *canon* of the ſame CHARLES (Lib. I. *de Legibus Francorum*, Cap. 145.) publiſhed on this account, gives us a ſtrong teſtimony of it. For the words of the *canon* are theſe: *Let a preſbyter have the euchariſt always ready, that when any perſon is ſick, or an infant afflicted, he may immediately give it him, that he may not die without the communion.*" *Theſaur. Eccleſ.* ſub voce Συναξις, Tom. II. p. 1136, 1138.

6. Mr. CHILLINGWORTH: "The neceſſity of the Lord's ſupper for *infants*, was taught by the conſent of the eminent Fathers of ſome ages, without *any oppoſition* from any of their contemporaries; and was delivered by them, not as *doctors*, but as *witneſſes*; not as their *own opinion*, but as *apoſtolic tradition.*"

tradition." In Mr. FOOTE's *Plain Account*, Lett. VIII. p. 105. *Note.*

7. Dr. WALL: "That which I conceive moſt probable on the whole matter is; That in CYPRIAN's time, the people of the church of Carthage, did oftentimes bring their children, younger than ordinary, to the communion. That in St. AUSTIN and INNOCENT's time, it was in the Weſt parts given to *mere infants*; and that this continued, from that time, for about SIX HUNDRED YEARS. That ſometime during this ſpace of ſix hundred years, the Greek Church, which was then low in the world, took this cuſtom from the Latin Church, which was more flouriſhing. That the Roman Church, about the year one thouſand, entertaining the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, let fall the cuſtom of giving the holy elements to infants: and the other Weſtern churches, moſtly following their example, did the like upon the ſame account. But that the Greeks, not having the ſame doctrine, *continued*, and *do ſtill continue* the cuſtom of communicating infants. They think that command of St. Paul, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat*; ſo to be underſtood, as not to exclude ſuch, as are by their age *uncapable* of examining themſelves, from partaking; but only to oblige all that are capable. As the like command of his, *If any one will not work, let him have nothing given him to eat*, muſt be ſo limited to ſuch as are able to work; as that infants, and ſuch as are not capable to work, muſt have victuals given them, though they do not work——VERY NEAR HALF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE WORLD, do ſtill continue that practice. The Greek Church, the Armenians, the Maronites, the Cophti, the Abaſſens, and the Muſcovites; as is related by the late Authors, JEREMIAS,

JEREMIAS, BRERewood, ALVARES, RICAUT, HEYLIN, &c. And so, for aught I know do *all the rest* of the Eastern Christians. And it is probable that the Western had done the same, had it not been for the doctrine of transubstantiation coming up in the church of Rome——It is a question in the present Christian church, whether giving the communion to infants be an error or a duty. The present Western Christians think it an error. The Greek Church, which is, I think the biggest half of Christendom, think it a duty." *Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 517, 518. *Def. of Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 384.

8. MOSHEIM: "It appears by many and undoubted testimonies, that this holy rite [the Lord's supper] was looked upon as essential to salvation; and when this is duly considered, we shall be less disposed to censure, as erroneous, the opinion of those who have affirmed that the Lord's supper was administered to infants during this [Second] century." *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 171.

9. VENEMA: "From the things before narrated, it plainly appears, what is to be concluded concerning *the admission of infants to the Lord's supper*, in the Second Century. For seeing access to the holy table was granted only to baptized persons, it is manifest that the eucharist was not *commonly* given to infants, if Pædobaptism was not then in *common use*. It may be added, that no sign of admitting infants to the holy supper appears before the time of CYPRIAN, in the third Century; who is the first that mentions it, as will appear in its proper place. From which, what has been said about Pædobaptism acquires additional force; seeing, *in the Ancient church, those two sacraments, in respect of the subjects*, WERE NEVER SEPARATED THE ONE FROM THE OTHER—Infants, in the Third Century, were

were generally admitted to baptiſm and *the Lord's ſupper*. That Pædobaptiſm was *now* the received practice in the churches, manifeſtly appears from CYPRIAN,—from whoſe writings it is evident, that baptized infants were partakers of the *euchariſt*; which cuſtom was continued through *many ages* —In the thirteenth Century, baptized infants *ceaſed* to be admitted to the euchariſt, becauſe it began to be adminiſtered *under one kind*." *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Secul. II. § 100. Secul. III. § 57. Secul. XIII. § 164.

10. Dr. PRIESTLY: "It is remarkable, that, in all Chriſtian antiquity, we always find, that *communion in the Lord's ſupper* IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BAPTISM. And no ſuch thing occurs, as that of any perſon having a right to *one* of theſe ordinances, and not to the *other*—There is no expreſs mention made of *infant baptiſm* before this [in CYPRIAN] of *infant communion*—The Apoſtle Paul ſeems to have referred to the cuſtom of giving the euchariſt to children in 1 Cor. vii. 14.—In all Chriſtian churches that have never been infected with the Romiſh ſuperſtition, and ſubject to the Papal authority, the right of infants to Chriſtian communion, was never invaded. Infant communion is to this day the practice of the Greek churches, of the Ruſſians, the Armenians, the Maronites, the Copts, the Aſſyrians, [perhaps it ſhould be *Syrians*] and probably all other Oriental churches; and it was alſo the practice of the Bohemians, who kept themſelves free from the Papal authority till very near the Reformation; and in a petition, which the Bohemian biſhops preſented to the Council of Baſil, in 1438, they pleaded very earneſtly to be allowed to continue this their ancient cuſtom—No objection can be made to this cuſtom, but what may, with *equal force*, be made to the cuſtom

cuſtom of *baptizing infants.*" *Addreſs on giving the Lord's Supper to Children*, p. 10, 17, 20, 28, 31.

12. Bp. TAYLOR: "Whether the holy communion may be given to infants, has been a great queſtion in the church of God; which in this inſtance has not been, as in others, divided by parties and ſingle perſons, but by whole ages; for ſome of the earlieſt ages of the church down to the time of CHARLES the Great, that is, for *above ſix hundred* years, the church of God did give the holy communion to newly baptized infants—It is certain that in Scripture there is nothing which *directly forbids* the giving the holy communion to infants. For though we are commanded to *examine*, and ſo to eat; yet this precept is not of itſelf neceſſary, but by reaſon of an introduced cauſe: juſt as they are commanded to *believe* and *repent*, who are to be baptized; that is, perſons that need it and that can do it, they muſt: and infants without examination can as well receive the effect of the euchariſt, as without repentance they can have the effect of *baptiſm*—Infants, indeed, cannot diſcern the Lord's body; ſo neither can they diſcern truth from falſehood, an article of faith from heretical doctrine; and yet to diſcern the one is as much required, as to diſcern the other: but in both the caſe is equal. For they muſt *diſcern* when they can *confound*, or *diſhonour*; but till they can do evil, they cannot be tied to do good. And it were hard to ſuppoſe *the whole church of God*, in her beſt and earlieſt times, to have continued for *above ſix hundred* years in a practical error; it will not well become our modeſty to judge them without further inquiry and greater evidence—The primitive church had all this to juſtify their practice, That the ſacraments of grace are the great channels of the

the grace of God; that this grace always deſcends upon them that do not hinder it, and therefore certainly to infants: and ſome do expreſſly affirm it, and none can with certainty deny, but that infants, if they did receive [the] communion, ſhould alſo in ſo doing receive the fruits of it. That to baptiſm there are many acts of pre-diſpoſition required, as well as to the communion; and yet the church, who very well underſtands the obligation of thoſe precepts, ſuppoſes no children to be obliged to thoſe pre-diſpoſitions to either ſacrament, but fits every commandment to a capable ſubject. That there is ſomething done on God's part, and ſomething on ours; that what belongs to us, obliges us then when we can hear and underſtand, but not before: but that which is on God's part is always ready to them that can receive it. That infants, although they cannot alone come to Chriſt, yet the church, their mother, can bring them in her arms. That they who are capable of the grace of the ſacrament, may alſo receive the ſign; and therefore the ſame grace being conveyed to them in one ſacrament, may alſo be imparted to them in the other. That as they can be born again without their own conſent, ſo they can be fed by the hands of others; and what begins without their own actual choice, may be renewed without their own actual deſire: and that therefore it may be feared leſt, if upon pretence of figurative ſpeeches, allegories, and alluſions, in the injunction of certain diſpoſitions, the holy communion be denied them; a gap be opened upon *equal* pretences to deny them baptiſm. That ſince the Jewiſh infants, being circumciſed, is uſed as an argument that they might be baptized; their eating of the paſchal lamb may alſo be a competent warrant to eat of that ſacrament in which alſo, as in the other,

other, the ſacrificed lamb is repreſented, as offered and ſlain for them. Now the church having ſuch fair probabilities and prudential motives, and no prohibition; if ſhe ſhall uſe her power to the purpoſes of kindneſs and charity, ſhe is not eaſily to be reproved, leſt, without neceſſity, we condemn *all* the primitive catholic church, and *all* the modern churches in the Eaſt and South to this day. Eſpecially, ſince without all diſpoſitions infants are baptized, there is leſs reaſon why they may not be communicated, having already received ſome real diſpoſitions towards this, even all the grace of the ſacrament of baptiſm, which is certainly ſomething towards the other: and after all, refuſing to communicate infants, entered into the church, upon an unwarrantable ground. For though it was confeſſed, that the communion would do them benefit, yet it was denied to them then when the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation entered; upon pretence, leſt, by *puking up* the holy ſymbols, the ſacrament ſhould be diſhonoured." *Worthy Communicant*, Chap. III. Sect. II. p. 202. 207, 208. 210, 211, 212.

12. Mr. JAMES PEIRCE: "'Tis well known, that the practice of giving the euchariſt to children is *at this day*, and has been for many ages paſt, uſed in the Greek churches, which are not of the Roman communion—This cuſtom continued in the Weſt, among the Bohemian churches, which kept themſelves pure from the Roman ſuperſtition and idolatry, till very near the Reformation—The Lord's ſupper was for ſeveral ages together given to infants in the Weſtern churches, and was not laid aſide in them till the eleventh or twelfth century, when the groſſeſt corruption and abuſes came in amongſt them—The giving the euchariſt to infants was the cuſtom in St. CYPRIAN's time—There is no reaſon to believe

lieve the practice of giving the Lord's ſupper to infants was peculiar to Carthage in St. CYPRIAN's time; nor is there any evidence, that it was not *univerſally* received in the Chriſtian church—'Tis highly probable this had been the practice of the Chriſtian church from the Apoſtles time—'Tis eaſy to account for our not meeting with any *expreſs mention* of this practice in the writers who lived before CYPRIAN, even ſuppoſing it to have been then received—I muſt here remind the reader of the manner in which St. CYPRIAN ſpeaks of this cuſtom; which I think plainly argues it not to have been any *novel* thing, brought in by himſelf, or in his own time, but to have been a received and ſettled uſage of the church. I may here urge, that we have no account of the *riſe* of this cuſtom. No one who pretends it was not derived from the Apoſtles, and conſtantly practiſed in the ſucceeding times, is able to give us any probable account of the time *when*, or occaſion upon *which*, it began. We never hear of any conteſt, or diſpute, that was occaſioned by this practice. And yet had it not been received from the Apoſtles, one would think ſuch a vaſt innovation as this would have been, muſt of neceſſity have raiſed ſome grievous quarrel. As there is no expreſs mention made of this uſage before CYPRIAN's time, ſo nor is there, as far as I can find, any thing mentioned before his time, from which it can be inferred that it was not then uſed—The very *ſilence* of antiquity is a ſtrong argument, they admitted infants to the Lord's ſupper, as well as to baptiſm—As the Ancients could never have fixed upon the interpretation of John iii. 5. which is ſo general among them, and makes *baptiſm abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*, unleſs they had admitted infants to baptiſm; ſo they could never have

have received ſuch an explanation of John vi. 53. as made the *euchariſt abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*, unleſs they had uſed to give the euchariſt to infants. And, to ſpeak my mind freely, I am perſuaded they equally miſſed the true ſenſe in both texts—What better recommendation of antiquity can almoſt any thing come with? It appears very probably to have been the practice of the *moſt early* times after the Apoſtles, and to have continued in the church, univerſally obſerved by the Greek church ever ſince; and by the Latin churches for about *a thouſand years*, and never laid aſide by them till they became moſt grievouſly corrupted, and till the monſter of tranſubſtantiation appeared in the world, and that the ſame ſuperſtition occaſioned the aboliſhing this cuſtom, and the taking away the cup from the laity together, and theſe were both profeſſedly done by the ſame Councils; and when the Latins laid it aſide, it ſtill continued among the purer Chriſtians of Bohemia, who bore ſuch a noble teſtimony againſt the ſuperſtition and tyranny of the Roman church, and was kept in uſe among them till within about half a century of the Reformation.—

"The *baptiſm* and *communion* of infants ſtand upon the *ſame foot*; and therefore they who admit the *one*, ought to admit the *other* alſo. For the confirming of this argument I will ſhew, firſt, That the *ſame reaſons* which are brought for infant baptiſm, are in like manner applicable to infant communion. Secondly, That the *objections* againſt infant communion will admit of the ſame anſwers, as thoſe againſt infant baptiſm—One ſtrong argument for infant baptiſm is taken from the words of the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. vii. 14. I need not ſay how much ſtreſs has been laid upon this, in the controverſy

verſy about infant baptiſm; nor do I think 'tis more than the text will bear. But I deſire only a reaſon, why this will not as well prove infants right to the euchariſt, as to baptiſm. Let it but be obſerved, what ſort of holineſs the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, and what alluſion he manifeſtly uſes. The *holineſs* he attributes to children ſtands in oppoſition to *uncleanneſs*; and ſo is to be explained from the ceremonial law. Now according to that, perſons were *unclean*, when they were debarred the public worſhip, and the communion of the people of God. And accordingly, in oppoſition thereto, then perſons were reckoned *holy*, when they were fit and qualified for the ſervice of God, and communion with his people, either in, or out of acts of worſhip—In this ſenſe the Apoſtle muſt be underſtood to ſay, the children of Chriſtians were not *unclean*, but *holy*; that they were not as unclean perſons under the law, debarred the public ſervice, or communion with the church of God. And in the ſame manner as this warrants their *baptiſm*, it will their *communion* alſo.

"I ſee no reaſon why infants right to the *euchariſt* may not, as well as their right to baptiſm, be pleaded from their being *members of the viſible church*. I grant the argument is good: Infants are members of the viſible church; therefore they are to be ſolemnly initiated and entered into it by the ordinance of baptiſm, which God has appointed for that purpoſe. But then, why ſhould not the ſame hold for their communion in the Lord's ſupper? If they are *members* of the church, and *baptized* into it, why ſhould they not *as ſuch* be brought up in it; and be ſtatedly nouriſhed and fed with that food which God has provided for his church? Upon what

what reaſon are *ſome of the members* of the viſible church, without *any fault* on their part, excluded from any of the privileges and advantages which God has granted to his church in common? For if infants are in the church of Chriſt, they muſt be reckoned his ſheep or his lambs; but, let them be one or the other, they are to be fed by his miniſters, and this is one way of doing it.

"Another plea for infant baptiſm, is their having an intereſt in the New Covenant. 'Tis urged, that baptiſm is a *ſeal* of the covenant, and nothing can be more proper, than to apply the ſeal of the covenant to thoſe to whom the covenant itſelf does belong. But then I deſire to know, Whether the *Lord's ſupper* is not a ſeal of that covenant? And if their part in the covenant will infer their right to *one ſeal*, why not to *the other?* There is great need here of ſome *very nice diſtinction*; or I cannot ſee how we ſhall be able to *urge the ſame argument*, when 'tis brought to prove their right to one ſacrament, and *anſwer it* when 'tis urged to prove their right to partake of the other.

"The *harſh* and *injurious treatment* of infants, which is the conſequence of denying them baptiſm, is urged ſometimes in behalf of their being baptized. They who refuſe to admit them into the church by baptiſm, are repreſented as treating their children like *dogs*; according to thoſe texts, *For without are dogs: 'Tis not meet to take the childrens bread and caſt it unto dogs.* And whether they who refuſe to give them children's bread, the ſacrament, as though it were *too holy* for them, treat them any better, may be eaſily judged of by thoſe words of our Saviour; *Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither caſt ye your pearls before ſwine.*

"Another

"Another argument is; Infants are capable of ſalvation, and therefore may receive baptiſm which is the means of ſalvation. And why does not this conſequence as well hold to their receiving the Lord's ſupper, which is *as much* a means of ſalvation, as baptiſm?—Another plea made uſe of for infant baptiſm is, That ſuch may be devoted to God. And certainly, this is as good a reaſon for their partaking of the Lord's ſupper, as of baptiſm; ſince the one is as properly *a devoting perſons to God*, as the other. And is it not ſtrange, there ſhould be ſufficient reaſon for devoting children to God in their *infancy*, and none at all to repeat and renew that dedication, before they are grown up to *maturity?*

"Great ſtreſs is often, in the matter of baptizing infants, laid upon that text, Luke xviii. 15, 16. Hence it has been argued, That Chriſt is *willing* little children ſhould come to him; that he is pleaſed when infants, who are not able to come themſelves, *are brought by others* to him, that he may bleſs them. And who has been able to aſſure thoſe who make uſe of this argument, that Chriſt is only willing to have them brought to him in *baptiſm*, and not in the *Lord's ſupper?* Is not the giving them the euchariſt, *as ſolemn a way* of bringing them to Chriſt, as the baptizing them? Why ſhould we think Chriſt has no proper opportunity of bleſſing them, when he gives to his church the ſolemn tokens and pledges of his love and favour? Or, why are we to ſuſpect or queſtion his gracious readineſs and inclination to bleſs them at ſuch a ſeaſon? And what reaſon can there be, that *the faith of parents* ſhould not be as available in bringing them to the Lord's ſupper, as to baptiſm?

"'Tis

"'Tis frequently alleged, That infants are *disciples*, Acts xv. 10. and therefore they ought, by baptism, to be inrolled as such, and to be solemnly initiated to his discipline. And certainly their receiving the Lord's supper is as proper a testimony of their *continuing*, as their baptism was of their being initiated *to be* his disciples. And since Christ would have his disciples *taught to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded*; certainly this is *one* of the things he has commanded, and this is *one* of the ways he has appointed of teaching his disciples. And what can be a more proper method of teaching baptized children to observe this ordinance in particular, than to bring them up from their very infancy to receive it? Is not this the way which all the world takes to teach children? Do people use to neglect to set children upon their feet, or begin to teach them to go, till they have acquired strength enough to be able to go alone? Do they use to forbear speaking to them in order to teach them to speak, till they are able to make themselves some distinction of sounds, or to understand all that is said to them? Is not every one sensible these things are to be taught them by little and little, and that they are to be begun with early, even before they come to take any great notice, or make much observation of things? And who can assure us, that Christ, though he would have young disciples, would not have any such method as this taken with them?

"Whereas 'tis pleaded in the behalf of infant baptism, that it has been practised *from the beginning of the Christian church*; I have likewise endeavoured to evidence the same to be true concerning infant communion—The parallel between the arguments in

the one and the other caſe, might be eaſily run a great deal further.

"The *objections* againſt infant communion will admit of the *ſame anſwers*, as thoſe againſt infant baptiſm. The only objections which carry any appearance of weight in them, are taken from their *incapacity* to perform ſome acts which are required in the adult communicants; ſuch as, *remembering* Chriſt, *diſcerning* the Lord's body, and previouſly *examining themſelves*. And juſt ſuch arguments may be and are alleged againſt *infant baptiſm*. Infants are not capable of that *repentance* and *faith*, which are required in the adult when they are baptized. And the ſame kind of anſwer will ſerve in both caſes—I ſhould be glad to know of thoſe Pædobaptiſts, who go on the contrary ſuppoſition, *what communion* they admit infants to, when they baptize them? What *one privilege* in the church do they admit them to? Right to communion in the other ſacrament 'tis ſuppoſed they have none: right to communion in prayers they are reckoned to have in common with Heathens, antecedently to their baptiſm. So that, for aught I ſee, the only privilege beſtowed upon them (I ſpeak only with reference to the communion of the Chriſtian church, of which they are made members by baptiſm) is this; That if ever they ſhall think fit to come to the Lord's table, *they ſhall not be baptized over again*—'Tis objected, That children, and eſpecially infants, cannot do this *in remembrance of Chriſt*; and therefore the nature and deſign of the Lord's ſupper ſhews they are not qualified to join in it, ſince our Saviour when he inſtituted it, expreſſly required his diſciples to do this *in remembrance of him*—Such kind of objections will as ſoon overthrow infants right to *baptiſm*, as to the *euchariſt*. *He that* BELIEVETH

and

and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved. If thou BELIEVEST WITH ALL THINE HEART, *thou mayeſt* be baptized. REPENT *and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins.* Theſe and many other ſuch texts may as well be urged to ſhew the *neceſſity* of repentance and faith before baptiſm; of which yet infants are as incapable, as they are of *remembering* Chriſt—Children are not capable of performing the duty of *ſelf-examination*, which is preſcribed as previouſly neceſſary to a perſon's receiving the Lord's ſupper, 1 Cor. xi. 28. I anſwer, If I ſhould allow the words of the Apoſtle to be taken in their true ſenſe, in the objection; yet the Pædobaptiſts muſt own, that the texts I mentioned before may be as ſtrongly urged againſt infant baptiſm, as this can againſt infant communion —Some will urge, That children ought not to receive the Lord's ſupper, becauſe they are not able *to diſcern the Lord's body*, as all communicants ought to do, according to the determination of the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. xi. 29. I might here anſwer as before; That this concerns the *adult*, and requires that ſuch as are capable of doing it ſhould diſcern the Lord's body, when they partake of his ſupper—— And certainly, as Chriſtians are to put a difference between the *ſacramental* and *common* bread and wine, ſo they are between the *baptiſmal* and *common* waſhing; and if an incapacity to make ſuch a difference will exclude infants from the *Lord's ſupper*, it may alſo from *baptiſm*——It may be further objected, That children cannot do what the Apoſtle ſuppoſes Chriſtians ſhould at the Lord's ſupper; that is, *ſhew forth Chriſt's death*, 1 Cor. xi. 26. I anſwer, —The Ancients did not think this ſhewing forth the Lord's death was *peculiar* to the Lord's ſupper: they thought, and as far as I can ſee with good

reaſon,

reaſon, that *baptiſm* was likewiſe a ſhewing forth Chriſt's death. *Therefore*, ſays CHRYSOSTOM, arguing againſt the Marcionites, *we ſhew forth his death upon all occaſions, in the myſteries, in* BAPTISM, *and all the reſt*—The ordinance of the Lord's ſupper is *very ſolemn*; but if children ſhould be admitted to communicate therein, it might take off the reſpect due to it, and bring it into contempt. Now here I grant, the ordinance is ſolemn, and that it ſhould be attended with anſwerable ſolemnity and ſerioufneſs of mind by all the adult; but—why may it not be as well alleged, that the adminiſtering *baptiſm* to infants is the ready way to bring that ſacrament, which is likewiſe a *ſolemn ordinance*, into contempt?—Will not this practice make the Lord's ſupper look like *a charm*, and encourage the Popiſh doctrine of ſacraments being effectual *ex opere operato*, without any regard had to the diſpoſition of the receiver? This can no otherwiſe be the conſequence of children's receiving the Lord's ſupper, than 'tis of their receiving baptiſm——The Lord's ſupper is an *eſtabliſhing* ordinance, deſigned to confirm the grace that is *already* in a perſon, and not to work the firſt grace in him; and therefore not proper to be given to any before that work is begun in them, and conſequently not to children—Let this ordinance be an *eſtabliſhing* ordinance. Is there any thing contradictory to that notion in letting children partake of it? I plead not for its being adminiſtered to any but ſuch as are baptized: and if they need *baptiſm*, certainly they need *eſtabliſhment* after baptiſm; and the Lord's ſupper, according to this notion, is appointed for that end." *Eſſay in favour of the Ancient Practice of giving the Euchariſt to Children*, paſſim. —See Mr. BINGHAM's *Origines Eccleſ.* B. XII. Chap. I. § 3. B. XV. Chap. IV. § 7. In the *latter*

latter of theſe paſſages Mr. BINGHAM ſays, "Biſhop BEDLE and ſome others have declared *intirely for it*;" *i. e.* for Infant communion.

REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Omitting various other particulars, included in the long quotation from Mr. PEIRCE, which contains an abſtract of his *Eſſay on giving the Euchariſt to Children*; we are here told by our learned opponents, That the Lord's ſupper was anciently given to *infants*. See No 1—12.—That there is no expreſs mention of Infant baptiſm, *before* that of Infant communion. See No 10.—That the practice of giving the holy ſupper to infants, originated in a miſunderſtanding of John vi. 53. See No 1, 2, 3.—That it followed *immediately* on their being baptized. See No 4.—That, in the ancient church, baptiſm and the ſacred ſupper were *never ſeparated*, in regard to their ſubjects. See No 9, 10.—That the Lord's ſupper was eſteemed *neceſſary* to the ſalvation of infants. See No 2. 6. 8.—That, when they were ſick, it was *privately* adminiſtered to them, as to adults in a ſimilar ſituation. See No 2. 5.—That Infant communion was the general practice for *ſix hundred* years; and, among the Bohemians, till *near the time* of the Reformation. See No 7. 9, 10.—That the riſe of the doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*, in the Latin church, was the occaſion of its being laid aſide. See No 7. 9, 10, 11. That Paul ſeems to refer to this cuſtom, in 1 Cor. vii. 14. See No 10.—That no objection can be made againſt it, which will not lie, with equal force, againſt Infant baptiſm. See No 10.—And, that very near *one half* the Chriſtians now in the world, *ſtill continue* the cuſtom. See No 7. 10.

Such

Such is the important intelligence communicated by theſe Pædobaptiſts, independent of the more laboured and critical account, which is given by Mr. PEIRCE.—To theſe various teſtimonies I beg leave to add, the atteſtation of ROBERT BARCLAY's impartial pen. "For aught that can be learned, ſays the celebrated Apologiſt, the uſe of this, [Infant communion] and Infant baptiſm, are of *a like age**." Whether, now, the whole of this be not in our favour, my Reader will judge.

REFLECT. II. The long quotation produced from Mr. PEIRCE, and the force of his reaſoning in defence of Infant communion, on the principles of Pædobaptiſm, render it ſuperfluous for me to enlarge, by way of reflection: the tenour of his argumentation being ſuch, as may ſafely challenge the united efforts of our oppoſers fairly to confute it, without ſapping the foundations of Infant baptiſm. Nor, indeed, have I as yet heard of any profeſſed anſwer that was ever attempted; though the cauſe of Pædobaptiſm ſeems to require it, and though the character of Mr. PEIRCE, for learning and parts, may be juſtly conſidered as a motive to ſuch an attempt. For as the learned author grafts Infant communion on the principles of Infant baptiſm, and in a maſterly way inſiſts upon it, that thoſe principles infer the *former* as well as the *latter*; our opponents cannot be inſenſible, that a thorough confutation of his *Eſſay* would be of great importance to their cauſe, when diſputing with us. Were we to behold the Pædobaptiſt hypotheſis fairly and intirely divorced from its old aſſociate, *Infant communion*; *that* being confirmed, while *this* is confuted; one great impediment would be removed out of the way of our commencing Pædobaptiſts.—

Nor

* *Apology*, p. 484.

Nor can we forbear commending the *conſiſtency* of ſentiment in Mr. PEIRCE, and of both ſentiment and practice in that half of the Chriſtian world, where each of our Lord's poſitive appointments is adminiſtered to children: becauſe we think our Brethren themſelves muſt feel the force of the following remark. "It may be reckoned, ſays Mr. PEIRCE, no ſmall advantage in this caſe, that we ſhall become more *conſiſtent* with ourſelves, in maintaining Infants church-membership and right to baptiſm. The Antipædobaptiſts hardly ſay any thing more plauſible on this head, than when they argue from our own proceedings, and aſk us, Why we do not adminiſter the Lord's ſupper to infants, as well as baptiſm*?" While, therefore, the title of infants to baptiſm is loudly pleaded, but their acceſs to the Lord's table utterly denied; and while the arguments of Mr. PEIRCE remain in their full force; it is natural for us to conclude, that the conduct of our Brethren, in this reſpect, is not reconcilable to the neceſſary conſequences of their own principles. No; for our author has made it appear, that Infant baptiſm and Infant communion are *twin ſiſters*; that they were adopted and cheriſhed as ſuch, by the whole Chriſtian church through a courſe of ages; that they are now foſtered, as bearing that ſtrict relation one to the other, by about half the Chriſtian world; and, conſequently, that they ſhould either live together and be ſupported, or die of the ſame diſeaſe and be diſcarded, at once and on equal grounds.

REFLECT. III. Our principles reſpecting baptiſm have often been charged, with *contracting* the privileges of the Goſpel Diſpenſation, ſo as to render it leſs favourable to infants than the Jewiſh OEconomy;

* *Eſſay*, Part IV. p. 171.

nomy; which is conſidered as a great abſurdity. To this we reply: It is with an ill grace that ſuch an objection is made by any of thoſe who maintain, that the *piety* of parents, is neceſſary to intitle their children to baptiſm; becauſe the objection may be retorted upon them. For, is it not manifeſt that they confine the adminiſtration of baptiſm to *much narrower* limits, than Jehovah allowed in regard to circumciſion? Who ever thought of circumciſion being reſtricted to the children of ſuch as appeared to be *truly pious?* When, or in what inſtance, was it made a condition of adminiſtering the painful rite, that either of the parents ſhould make a credible profeſſion of *repentance* towards God, and *faith* in the promiſed Meſſiah? Their being deſcended from Abraham, and making a general profeſſion of Judaiſm, were, in this caſe, quite ſufficient. Why, then, ſhould theſe objectors except againſt the baptizing of *any* child whatever, provided either of its parents profeſs Chriſtianity? Why lay the privileges of infants under ſuch reſtrictions as were not known to the ancient Jews? for that, on this hypotheſis, a very ſmall number of children ſhould be baptized, muſt appear to all who duly conſider thoſe words, *Many are called, but few choſen.*—Nor was true ſpiritual converſion to God, no, nor yet a *profeſſion* of it, required as neceſſary to the circumciſion of a proſelyte from Paganiſm. On the foundation of this objection, therefore, our Brethren might ſay, that we render the privileges of the Chriſtian Covenant, leſs than thoſe of the Jewiſh OEconomy, if we inſiſt on a credible profeſſion of repentance and faith from *adults*, that were brought up in Judaiſm, Mohammedaniſm, or Heatheniſm: and thus, to ſatisfy the objector, we muſt adopt the conduct of Popiſh Miſſionaries among the Indians.—Beſides,

near

near one half the posterity of Abraham were members of the Jewish church *without* being circumcised, or having any similar ceremony performed upon them; and this, considering circumcision as a painful and bloody rite, was a greater privilege than that of the male children. Why, then, on the ground of ancient privilege, do not our opponents infer, that females are to be honoured with complete membership in the Gospel church, without being baptized?—Again: Might not one who approves of Infant communion make the same complaint against our opposers in general, for witholding the sacred supper from little children? for Mr. PEIRCE has proved, beyond all reasonable doubt, that they were partakers of the paschal feast*.——Once more: The Papists advance a similar argument, in vindication of their darling infallibility; and endeavour to fasten absurdities on our Protestant principles, for daring to question their haughty claim. To which Bp. BURNET answers in the following manner: "It is a vain thing to prove that this [infallibility] must be in the church, because otherwise a great many *absurdities* must needs follow, if it were not in it. When it is once proved that *God has given it* to his church, we shall very willingly yield, that he had very good reasons for it;—but it is a very preposterous way to argue, That God must have done such a thing, because we fancy that it is necessary to *prevent* some great evil, or to *procure* some very great good. For this is only to pretend to prove, that God *ought* to have done somewhat that he has not done; unless they can at the same time prove, that God has done it: this is to conclude, *That his ways must be as ours are, and that*

* *Essay*, p. 116—128.

*his thoughts muſt be as our thoughts**."—This anſwer, by only ſubſtituting *Infant baptiſm*, for *Papal infallibility*, will apply with equal force to the objection we are now conſidering.

We have been frequently blamed alſo, for denying the validity of *inferential* proof, in defence of Infant baptiſm; and for demanding a divine *precept*, or an apoſtolic *example*, as the only thing that can ſupport it. Nay, our oppoſers have ſometimes reflected upon us, as if we rejected *all* arguments of that kind, in the affairs of religion. That we avow the *former*, is an acknowledged fact; that we have done the *latter*, is a groſs miſrepreſentation. Let the ſubject of inquiry be *moral* truth, or *moral* duty, and we admit inferential proof in as large an extent as any of our oppoſers: concluding, that a *genuine* inference from a moral principle, and relating to things of a moral nature, has all the certainty of the principle itſelf. Or, if any Baptiſt have denied this, we cannot but conſider him, as either weak, or perverſe, or very inadvertent. But, when *poſitive* duties are under our notice; when either the *manner* of performing thoſe duties, or the proper *ſubject* of them, is before us; the caſe is greatly altered. For the inquiry being intirely converſant about the *ſovereign pleaſure* of God, concerning an article of human duty, which abſolutely depends on a *manifeſtation* of the Divine will; the nature of the caſe forbids our expecting any intelligence relating to it, except what ariſes from divine precept, or ſcriptural precedent. Such is the ordinance of baptiſm, and ſuch was the ſyſtem of ritual appointments in former times. Now, to what an extent analogical reaſoning and inferential proof may be purſued, in regard to poſitive inſtitutions, and for the ſupport of error, Mr.

* *Four Diſcourſes to the Clergy*, Diſc. III. p. 174.

Mr. PEIRCE has given us a ſtriking inſtance—ſuch an inſtance, that we deſpair of ſeeing his arguments really anſwered, on any principles but thoſe of a Baptiſt. If our oppoſers, however, be otherwiſe minded, we ſhould be glad to ſee a trial of their ſtrength, by labouring to confute him on the principles of Pædobaptiſm. To which I may add, that Proteſtant authors, in general, when exploding a multitude of ceremonies in the Popiſh ſyſtem; and Proteſtant Diſſenters, in particular, when oppoſing various rites appointed in the Engliſh Liturgy, are ſure to proceed on this principle; *There is neither precept nor precedent for them in the word of God.* This maxim is a firm barrier againſt encroachments on the government of Chriſt, by princely domination, prieſtly pride, and popular unſteadineſs. It guards the throne of our aſcended Sovereign, and ſecures his honour as legiſlator in his own kingdom. This maxim duly obſerved, his diſciples treat with equal contempt, the mandates of a pope and the edicts of a prince, the canons of a council and the ſtatutes of a parliament, whenever they preſume to appoint rites of divine worſhip, or to alter thoſe which Chriſt ordained. But if this rule of religious conduct be outraged by one ſet of Proteſtants, arrogantly claiming, for ſomething called THE CHURCH, a power *to decree rites or ceremonies*; or if, while its authority is acknowledged, its operation be ſuſpended by others, in favour of ſome ancient prejudice, or prevailing practice; the former cannot, with conſiſtency, maintain their ground againſt the *votaries* of Rome, nor the latter defend their Diſſent from the *National* Eſtabliſhment. For, while both parties, whether in the ſame, or different ways, forſake that rule which obliges all; they lay themſelves

ſelves open to the mutual attacks of each, and thus the controverſy is continued.

Having diſcuſſed the principal articles in this controverſy, according to the plan propoſed, I ſhall now conclude with a few

GENERAL REMARKS.

REMARK I. As it appears from the foregoing pages, that a great number of the moſt learned and eminent Pædobaptiſts of different communions, have made ſuch declarations as are much in our favour, concerning the mode, the ſubject, and the deſign of baptiſm; we cannot but acknowledge their impartiality and candour with ſincere approbation: and, while paying this tribute of honour to thoſe amiable virtues, we cheerfully adopt the language of Dr. FULKE, when addreſſing the Rhemiſh Jeſuits. "We *accept* your teſtimony, ſays he, as *the witneſs of our adverſaries**." We further ſay, with DAILLE; "This teſtimony of theirs, to *us*, is worth a *thouſand* others; ſeeing it comes from ſuch who, in *our* opinion, *are evidently intereſted to ſpeak quite otherwiſe*†."—Now though we are far from conſidering, either the number, or weight of the preceding quotations, as conſtituting any part of the ground on which our diſtinguiſhing conduct proceeds; and though we appeal to the Inſpired Writings, as containing our *only* rule and law; yet, perhaps, the Reader may be of opinion, that the numerous teſtimonies produced, from ſo many reſpectable authors, are of ſufficient authority to teach ſome of our opponents a little more modeſty and caution,

* *On* Acts xvii. 4.

† *Right Uſe of the Fathers*, Book I. p. 39.

caution, when writing or ſpeaking againſt our diſcriminating ſentiment and practice. Yes, while ſuch a multitude of the firſt literary and religious characters give their ſuffrage ſo much in our favour, the candid Reader may, peradventure, conclude, That our oppoſers ſhould not call us ANABAPTISTS, by way of reproachful diſtinction *—That, when Meſſrs. FEATLY, BAXTER, WILLS, D'ASSIGNY, RUSSEN, HENRY, and others, treat the practice of immerſion with *bitter contempt*, as indecent, or dangerous; they manifeſt their love of hypotheſis, rather than their learning, or candour, or piety—That the charging us with *a want of regard* to the beſt intereſts of our infant offſpring, and leaving them to the uncovenanted mercies of God, is very precipitate †—That the repreſenting us as *obſtinate bigots*, who are chiefly concerned to ſupport a favourite

* Dr. WALL ſays, "As they diſown the name of *Anabaptiſts*, or *Rebaptizers*, ſo I have no where given it to them." *Hiſt. Inf. Bap.* p. 335. So that very learned and impartial hiſtorian profeſſor VENEMA, after having enumerated the diſtinguiſhing ſentiments of the Dutch Mennonites, or Baptiſts, in the ſixteenth century, adds; "Whence it is gathered, that the name, *Anabaptiſts*, does not agree to them; becauſe, according to their opinion, lawful baptiſm is *not repeated*." *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. VII. p. 439.—See CHAP. II. No 44.

† Mr. MARSHALL, in the laſt century, charges the Baptiſts with being guilty of pronouncing "a *raſh* and *bloody ſentence*; condemning infants as out of the ſtate of grace; condemning all the infants of the whole church of Chriſt, as having nothing to do with the covenant of grace." And then he tells them, that *their* conduct "*exceeds* the cruelty of Herod and Hazael, in ſlaying and daſhing the infants of Iſrael againſt the wall." In Mr. TOMBES's *Examen*. p. 170.

a favourite point, is ungenerous and unjuſt*—And, that raw ſtriplings, who know but little about the controverſy, ſhould be careful how they mount the pulpit, or take up the pen, to declaim againſt us under a notion, that their cauſe is *all bright with evidence*, while ours is involved in thick darkneſs;—that erudition and piety, that genius and impartiality, unite in ſupporting theirs; while ſound learning and extenſive reading, while candour and common ſenſe, withold their patronage from ours. Becauſe it appears, from the preceding Chapters, that, ſuppoſing the Baptiſts ever ſo illiterate, ignorant, and bigotted; almoſt all the premiſes from which they argue are either expreſſly or implicitly granted, by ſome of the moſt eminent Pædobaptiſts that ever filled the Profeſſor's chair, or that ever adorned the Proteſtant pulpit.

REMARK II. It is very obſervable, that ſo many Pædobaptiſts themſelves have admitted the *facts* on which we reaſon, and that they have either *expreſſly rejected* the texts uſually pleaded againſt us, or *ſo explained* them, as renders their application in ſupport of Infant baptiſm quite impertinent. *They have admitted the* FACTS *on which we reaſon.* Do we maintain, for inſtance, that baptiſm is a *poſitive* inſtitution, and that poſitive rites depend *intirely* on the revealed will of God, in regard to the manner of performing them, the perſons to whom they belong, and the ſignification of them? All this they readily grant, in CHAP. I. Do we inſiſt, that the term baptiſm, properly ſignifies *immerſion*? They expreſſly allow it, CHAP. II. Do we aſſert, that the principal thing intended by the ordinance is,

* Dr. MAYO, through an exceſs of candour and complaiſance, has lately called us, "WATERY BIGOTS." *True Scrip. Doc. of Bap.* p. 33.

is, a repreſentation of *our communion with Chriſt*, in his death, burial, and reſurrection? It is cheerfully granted, CHAP. III. Do we maintain, that immerſion was the *apoſtolic* practice, and that, except in extraordinary caſes, it was the *general* cuſtom for *thirteen hundred* years? They confirm our ſentiment, CHAP. IV. Do we occaſionally obſerve, that immerſion is the *preſent* practice of the Greek and Oriental churches, and that thoſe churches include about one half of the Chriſtian world? Their own pens bear teſtimony for us, CHAP. V. Do we inſiſt, that plunging is *more expreſſive* of the great things intended by the ordinance, than pouring or ſprinkling? They accede to our opinion, CHAP. VI. Do we aſſert, that the *firſt* inſtance of pouring or ſprinkling, inſtead of immerſion, which is expreſſly recorded, was about the middle of the third Century, and then condemned; that the *apoſtate Church of Rome*, all ſovereign as her claims are, introduced pouring to common practice; and, that the Proteſtant Churches received it from *her* polluted hands? Theſe being ſtubborn facts, are all acknowledged, CHAP. VII. Do we maintain, that, in ordinary caſes, immerſion is *not prejudicial* to health? Pædobaptiſt phyſicians, without a fee, and medical practice, without heſitation, confirm our opinion, CHAP. VII. REFLECT. IV. Do we aſſert, that no power on earth has authority to *alter* the law of Chriſt, or to *depart* from apoſtolic example, in regard to immerſion? So do they, in effect, when diſputing with Papiſts concerning the ſacred ſupper, *Ibid.* REFLECT. III. Do we contend, that there is *no expreſs* command, nor *plain* example, in the New Teſtament, relating to Infant baptiſm? It is granted by them, CHAP. VIII. Do we plead, that there is no evidence of Pædobaptiſm being practiſed,

tiſed, before the concluſion of the *ſecond*, or beginning of the *third* Century? This alſo is readily granted, even by ſome of thoſe who were the greateſt adepts in Chriſtian antiquities, CHAP. IX. Is it our opinion, that the *extravagant notions* of the Fathers, in the ſecond, and beginning of the third Century, concerning the great utility of baptiſm, and their miſunderſtanding of Joh. iii. 5. laid the foundation of Pædobaptiſm? It is allowed, CHAP. X. Do we conſider the arguments from *proſelyte baptiſm*, an *external covenant*, and *circumciſion*, as of no avail to the cauſe of Infant baptiſm? They concur in our opinion, CHAP. XI. SECT. I. II. III. Do we treat with contempt the plea of pretended *apoſtolic tradition*, unſupported by Scripture? So do all Proteſtants, except Pædobaptiſm, Epiſcopacy, or ſomething ſimilar, ſolicit their patronage. See CHAP. XI. SECT. V. Once more: Do we maintain, that Infant baptiſm and Infant communion were introduced about the *ſame time*; that they are ſupported by *kindred arguments*; that they were *equally common* for a courſe of ages; and that they are *ſtill united* in the practice of half the Chriſtian world? We have the happineſs to find, that theſe facts are confirmed by their learned pens, in CHAP. XII.

Again: In regard to paſſages of Scripture, uſually pleaded againſt us, we have the pleaſure to ſee, that various eminent Pædobaptiſts either *expreſſly* reject them, as having nothing to do in the controverſy; or *ſo interpret* them, as renders their application to Infant baptiſm quite impertinent. Do we, for example, conſider MAT. xxviii. 19. as requiring inſtruction, *previous* to baptiſm? So do they, CHAP. XI. SECT. IV. § I. Do we maintain that GEN. xvii. 7. ſpeaks of a *twofold* ſeed, carnal and ſpiritual? They freely allow it, *Ibid.* § II. Do we

we underſtand EZEK. xvi. 20, 21. as regarding the Iſraelites on the foundation of the *Sinai* covenant? They acquieſce, *Ibid.* § III. Do we aſſert, that MAT. xix. 14. is no proof of Infant baptiſm? They coincide with us, *Ibid.* § IV. Do we inſiſt upon it, that our Lord, in JOH. iii. 5. is not ſpeaking about the neceſſity of *baptiſm?* So do they, *Ibid.* § V. Do we aſſert, that ACTS ii. 39. is impertinently cited in proof of Infant baptiſm? They confirm our aſſertion, *Ibid.* § VI. Do we conſider the baptizing of *houſeholds* as equally unavailing, when produced againſt us? So do they, *Ibid.* § VII. Do we interpret the words of Paul, ROM. xi. 16. as foreign to the cauſe of Pædobaptiſm? They agree with us, *Ibid.* § VIII. And, finally, do we explain 1 COR. vii. 14. as relating to *lawful marriage* and a *legitimate offspring?* Even *here*, we are not intirely deſerted by them, but ſome of them afford us their friendly ſuffrage, *Ibid.* § IX.—In a word, there is not, that I recollect, *one topic* of argument, nor *one text* of Scripture, uſually pleaded in favour of Infant baptiſm, by the more judicious of our opponents; but it is either expreſſly caſhiered, as having nothing to do with the controverſy; or ſo underſtood, as to be of no ſervice to the cauſe. We have the honour, therefore, to agree with *many* of them, as to a *great part* of our premiſes; and with *ſome* of them reſpecting the *whole*. Yes, amazing as it may ſeem, we are honoured with having *ſome* of them for our aſſociates, in almoſt every thing, except the *concluſion*. Here, indeed, we are utterly deſerted by them. Nor can it be otherwiſe, while they are PÆDO, and we ANTIPÆDO, Baptiſts. However, whether our concluſion or theirs be right, it is manifeſt that, notwithſtanding the number of evidences uſually ſubpœnaed againſt us, when the validity

lidity of Infant ſprinkling is to be *publickly* tried; and notwithſtanding the formidable appearance they frequently make, in the eye of a ſuperficial obſerver; yet, when thoſe very evidences are impartially examined by Pædobaptiſts in *private*, without being perplexed with captious queries, they have not *a word* to ſay for Infant ſprinkling; but all their depoſitions are directed to prove doctrines and facts of a quite different nature. Whether, therefore, the following triplet be not applicable to Infant ſprinkling, I leave the Reader to judge.

"With witneſſes many, this cauſe did abound;
With ſome that were hang'd, and ſome that were drown'd,
And ſome that were loſt, and ſome never found."

Further: If you aſk Pædobaptiſts, *whoſe* infants are to be baptized, on *what ground*, and for *what purpoſes?* they will be found extremely divided. Do you inquire, *whoſe* infants are intitled to baptiſm? Many of them will anſwer, "Thoſe of *believers*." This, however, is rejected by multitudes, as a narrow notion, and an uncharitable reſtriction. It is caſhiered, as placing the children of nominal Chriſtians in a worſe predicament than that of the infants of ungodly Jews, under the former diſpenſation, in regard to circumciſion. Thus, for inſtance, Mr. D'Assigny interrogates and anſwers. "What right have the infants of vicious parents, who are no better than Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans, to baptiſm? I anſwer, the ſame right they have to baptiſm, as the infants of debauched Jews, of Publicans and ſinners, had to circumciſion*." Agreeable to this, is the practice of the Church

* *Myſtery of Anabaptiſm*, p. 195.

Church of England, and of other National Eſtabliſhments. Some Diſſenters alſo, ſeem to be of the ſame opinion. So Dr. AMES, for example, ſays; "Expoſed children, whoſe parents are not known, if they were born among Chriſtians, are charitably to be accounted the children of Chriſtians, [and to be baptized,] if there be not juſt cauſe of preſuming the contrary*." Thus Mr. TOWGOOD: "*Foundling* infants, are very rationally brought to baptiſm by thoſe who will engage ſolemnly for their Chriſtian education†." Mr. HENRY thinks, that if the parents be excommunicated, the right of their children to baptiſm is, for the preſent, *ſuſpended*‡; but Dr. AMES is of opinion they may be baptized, if ſuitable ſponſors be found for them§. Many, however, extend the friendly arms of Pædobaptiſm yet wider; even ſo wide as to embrace "the children of Pagans, of Turks, and of Jews, if, by purchaſe, or the right of war, they come under the power of the church." So DEYLINGIUS||.

Under this head I would mention another particular, about which, it is probable, our oppoſers may differ; a particular, the ſuggeſting of which would hardly be excuſed by ſome of our Brethren, if it were not *very gravely* propoſed for diſcuſſion by a learned Pædobaptiſt. DEYLINGIUS, when writing a ſyſtem of paſtoral duty for the inſtruction of young miniſters, after having laid it down as an incontrovertible truth, that every living birth which has the appearance of a *man*, ſhould be baptized, adds; "Concerning a *monſtrous* birth, it is now and then *exceedingly doubtful*—If it be animated by a rational ſoul,

* *De Conſcientia*, L. IV. C. XXVII. § 5.
† *Infant Bap. a reaſonable Service*, p. 53, 54.
‡ *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 72. § *Ut ſupra*, § 8.
‖ *De Prudent. Paſtoral.* Pars III. C. III. § 12.

ſoul, and its principal members, for example, the *head*, bear the human form; it ought, without peradventure, to be baptized. But what muſt be done if it have the appearance of a *double* man? It is queried, whether it ſhould be baptized *once* only, or *twice?* If it cannot be accurately and certainly known, whether *two* men be corporally united, it is more prudent for baptiſm to be conferred upon it but once: but it muſt be done *twice*, if it plainly appear, that the monſtrous birth has two ſouls; which may be juſtly ſuppoſed, when—for inſtance, one body *ſleeps*, and the other is awake; one *ſmiles* and is pleaſed, the other *ſheds tears*, or is offended. For theſe are marks of a twofold perſon; though, perhaps, the feet, or the back, repreſent only one individual*." Inſtances of which kind, the author mentions; and one perfectly ſimilar has lately appeared on the records of a learned ſociety †.—How far our oppoſers in this country may approve of the eminent Lutheran ſtarting ſuch a knotty queſtion, or what they may think of the ſolution which he has given, I do not know: but, on their hypotheſis, the way of duty in this caſe muſt be very dubious, whether ſuch a birth be the iſſue of believing parents, or not; becauſe it cannot ſpeak for itſelf, to declare whether it be *two* perſons, or only *one*. If, therefore, it be the *latter*, to baptize it twice, would incur the charge of Anabaptiſm; and if it be the *former*, to baptize it only once, would be to withold a ſeal of the covenant where it was due, and to imitate the ſuppoſed cruelty of the Baptiſts towards their offspring.

Do you inquire, what is the principal *ground* of Pædobaptiſm? CYPRIAN, its great patron, and others

* *Ibid.* § 17.

† See *Philoſoph. Tranſact.* Vol. LXXII.

others in former times, conſidered a ſuppoſed *univerſality* of divine grace, and the *neceſſity* of baptiſm, as the main foundation on which they proceeded. AUSTIN, and others, the faith of the *church*, as Mr. TOMBES has obſerved. Our Engliſh Eſtabliſhment, a profeſſion of faith by the *ſponſors*. Dr. HAMMOND rejects the ancient rite of circumciſion, on which many lay a conſiderable ſtreſs, and ſeems to view the Jewiſh *proſelyte bathing* as the beſt ground of Infant baptiſm*: while Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL reprobates the proſelyte plunging, and recurs to *circumciſion* as a proper ſupport for Pædobaptiſm †. Dr. PRIESTLEY ſays, "I conſider the baptizing of my children, not as directly implying that they have *any intereſt in it*, or in *the things ſignified by it*, but as a part of my own profeſſion of Chriſtianity ‡." Mr. BAXTER makes the *faith* of the parent, the condition of the children's church-membership and of their ſalvation §. Mr. HENRY conſiders a *profeſſion* of faith made by the parent, as the ground of an infant's title to baptiſm ‖.—Others directly oppoſe this. Thus, for inſtance, Mr. PERKINS: "There is *no reaſon* that the wickedneſs of the parents ſhould prejudice the child, in things pertaining to eternal life **." Abp. LEIGHTON ſtill more ſtrongly, in the following words: "Touching baptiſm, freely my thought is, it is a *weak* notion taken up on truſt almoſt generally, to conſider ſo much, or at all, the qualifications of the *parents*. Either it is a benefit to infants, or it is not. If *none*, why then adminiſter

* See CHAP. XI. SECT. I. REFLECT. IV.

† *Ibid.* No 6. ‡ *Hiſt. Corrup. Chriſt.* Vol. II. p. 75. § *Plain Scrip. Proof*, p. 315. ‖ *Treatiſe on Bap.* p. 76. ** *Works*, Vol. II. p. 264. in Mr. KEACH's *Rector Rectified*, p. 210.

niſter it at all? But if it *be*, then why ſhould the poor innocents be prejudged of it for the parent's cauſe, if he profeſs but ſo much of a Chriſtian, as to offer his child to that ordinance? For that the *parent's faith* gives the child a right to it, IS NEITHER CLEAR FROM SCRIPTURE, NOR ANY SOUND REASON *."—WITSIUS, VITRINGA, VENEMA, and others, conſider the children of believers, as in a *relative* ſtate of grace; and ſo make *that* the main foundation of Pædobaptiſm †: while Bp. PRIDEAUX maintains, that infants are to be baptized, becauſe they have "the faith of the *covenant*, though not the faith of *covenantees* ‡."

Do you aſk, for what *purpoſes* infants are to be baptized? The Church of England will tell you, that by baptiſm, they are made *members* of Chriſt, *children* of God, and *inheritors* of the kingdom of heaven. Others deny this, and maintain, that the children of believers are to be conſidered as intereſted in thoſe high and heavenly bleſſings, prior to their baptiſm ||. The Roman Catholics make it *neceſſary* to ſalvation: the Church of England, makes it *generally* neceſſary to final happineſs; with which eſtabliſhment the Lutherans agree. Of which opinion was the late Mr. G. WHITEFIELD; and ſo is Mr. J. WESLEY §.—Multitudes of Pædobaptiſts, however, deny this regenerating energy and high neceſſity of Infant baptiſm; though they conſider many and great benefits as connected with it.

Many

* *Select Works*, p. 548. † WITS. *Miſcell. Sac.* Tom. II. Exercit. XIX. § 5, 19. VITRING. *Obſerv. Sac.* L. II. C. VI. § 20. VENEM. *Diſſertat. Sac.* L. III. C. III. § 1. ‡ *Faſcicul. Controverſ.* p. 290. || WITSII *Miſcel. Sac.* Tom. II. Exercit XIX. § V. p. 617. § See their words, CHAP. X. REFLECT. III.

Many of them aſſert its neceſſity, to initiate them, *into the church*; but others inſiſt upon it, that the offspring of believers are intitled to baptiſm, becauſe they *are* members of the church. So greatly are they divided among themſelves!

This reminds me of a ſimilar difference among the Papiſts, relating to their *church*, as the ſeat of infallibility. "By *the church*, ſays Mr. POOLE, ſome underſtand the *ancient* church, whoſe teſtimony is expreſſed in the writings of the Fathers: others, the *preſent* church, whoſe living teſtimony and authority, they ſay, is ſufficient, without any further enquiry. And this preſent church too, they cannot agree what it is. Some ſay, the *Pope*; others, a *general Council*; and others, the Pope and a Council *together*. Nor are they leſs at variance about the *grounds* on which they build the church's authority. This, ſome lay in the *teſtimony of ſcripture*; others, in the authority of the *Fathers*; others, in *univerſal oral tradition*; others, in the *motives of credibility* *."—Now, if the conduct of Proteſtants be rational in concluding, that this variety of ſentiments among the votaries of Papal infallibility, is a ſtrong preſumption that they have *no ſolid* foundation at all on which to proceed; why ſhould not the numerous and oppoſite opinions of Pædobaptiſts, relating to the ſubject before us, be conſidered in a ſimilar light? When reflecting on theſe things, I have been amazed to find that young men ſhould preach and write againſt us with ſuch a petulant and haughty air as they have often done; ſetting themſelves very gravely to prove that the Greek

* *Nullity of Romiſh Faith*, Introduct. p. 1. See *Popery Confuted by Papiſts*, p. 59. relating to ſimilar differences about *Tranſubſtantiation*.

Greek prepoſitions, εις * and εκ, in certain connections, muſt be conſtrued *to*, and *from*, which nobody ever denied;

* Though the meaning of this particle is frequently varied, according to the connections in which it ſtands; yet the learned I think will readily grant, that its primary and moſt common ſignification is *into*. When uſed in a *local* ſenſe, it ſeldom ſignifies any thing elſe, in the New Teſtament; and when connected with ὑδωρ, Ιορδανης, or ποταμος, it never, if I miſtake not, has any other meaning. See Mat. xvii. 15. Mark i. 9. and ix. 22. Acts viii. 38. Rev. xvi. 4. Does the inſpired hiſtorian inform us, for inſtance, that Philip and the Eunuch *came* TO *a certain water?* his language is, ηλθον ΕΠΙ τι ὑδωρ. Does he deſcribe them, as alighting from the chariot, and as *uſing* the waters? he varies the prepoſition, and his words are, κατεβησαν αμφοτεροι ΕΙΣ το ὑδωρ; *they went down both* INTO *the water.* Luke repreſents them as coming *to* the water, before baptiſm is mentioned; and he deſcribes them as going *into* the water, before baptiſm is adminiſtered. See Acts viii. 36, 38. The prepoſition εις, being here uſed with the moſt explicit reference to the adminiſtration of baptiſm, and being manifeſtly deſigned to expreſs a different idea from that of the particle επι; it muſt, in this paſſage, ſignify *into*. The Reader may obſerve a ſimilar uſe of theſe two particles, in John vi. 16, 17. *His diſciples went down,* επι, TO *the ſea, and entered,* εις, INTO *a ſhip.* So, Mark xvi. 2, 5. *They came,* επι, TO *the ſepulchre,----and entering,* εις, INTO *the ſepulchre:* and ſo Acts xii. 10. *They came,* επι, TO *the iron gate, that leadeth,* εις, INTO *the city.* Thus BEZA, CASTALIO, Dr. DODDRIDGE, and others, render the laſt of theſe paſſages; and I think more agreeably than by our tranſlators, who have rendered both the Greek prepoſitions, by the obſolete Engliſh particle, *unto*.---Now, as the baptiſm of this eunuch is, perhaps, more circumſtantially

denied; and then flouriſhing away, as if they had intirely confuted us, in regard to the mode of adminiſtration—Undertaking to *evince*, alſo, that the covenant of God with Abraham included both temporal and ſpiritual bleſſings; but without diſtinguiſhing between his *carnal* and *ſpiritual* ſeed: and then with confidence conclude, that the children of believers are intitled to baptiſm. Yes, I have been ſurpriſed to find, that they ſhould aſſume ſuch a confident and magiſterial tone, when defending the practice of Infant ſprinkling; as if the facts and the texts on which we argue, were nothing at all to the purpoſe—as if divine precepts and apoſtolic examples, primitive Fathers and Greek Lexicons, were all on their ſide; and as if all the particulars relating to their hypotheſis perfectly harmonized. To ſuch inexperienced youths the advice of an ancient monarch may, perhaps, be ſuitable: *Tarry at Jericho till your beards be grown.*

But is it not, I appeal to the Reader, is it not a very ſingular phenomenon in the religious world, that ſo many denominations of Proteſtants ſhould all agree in one general concluſion, and yet differ to ſuch an extreme about the *premiſes* whence it ſhould be inferred? Is it not aſtoniſhing, that they ſhould thus diſagree one with another, when all are

tially related than that of any other perſon in the New Teſtament; we are led to conſider the prepoſition in queſtion, as having the ſame ſignification, whenever it is uſed in a correſpondent connection by the inſpired writers. To which I may add, if the particles εις and εκ, in this and ſimilar connections, do not naturally expreſs the ideas of *into* and *out of*; we ſhould be glad of information, what other Greek prepoſitions the ſacred Hiſtorians *could* have uſed, that would have conveyed thoſe ideas with greater preciſion.

profeſſedly ſupporting the ſame common cauſe? I will venture to callenge our Pædobaptiſt Brethren, to produce any inſtance of an equal diſagreement, among Proteſtants, about the proper mediums of proof, where the ſame general concluſion is intended by each. That a number of perſons, however judicious or pious, when writing in defence of a doctrine or duty, ſhould not all think the ſame topics of argument, or texts of Scripture, applicable to the ſubject before them, is not to be wondered; but then, in every other inſtance that I have obſerved, they all agree in conſidering *ſome* particular arguments and *ſome* paſſages of Scripture, as *properly belonging* to the ſubject of diſcuſſion. Thus it is with the Baptiſts, in regard to their diſtinguiſhing ſentiment and practice. They perfectly agree, ſo far as I have obſerved, in applying many declarations and facts, recorded by the Apoſtles, as *directly in point*, with reference to the mode, the ſubject, and the deſign of baptiſm: and this, I think, our oppoſers themſelves muſt acknowledge.—Here, however, we have an example of a *ſingular* kind. Pædobaptiſm is the thing to be defended, by a number of learned pens; and each of them glows with zeal for its honour and ſafety. But, behold, ſome of them reject *one* topic of argument, and ſome *another*; theſe except againſt an application of *that* ſacred text, and thoſe explain *this* in ſuch a manner as is foreign to the ſubject; until all the premiſes are frittered away, and nothing remains, in which they are unanimous, but a *naked concluſion:* and yet this very concluſion muſt be worded with caution, or you will not have the pleaſure to ſee them *quite* unanimous. For, while multitudes of them labour to prove Pædobaptiſm *highly neceſſary*, and while moſt of them conſider

conſider it in the light of *parental duty*, on the infant's behalf; others, and among them the great VITRINGA, only plead for its being *lawful*, or that there is *no harm* in it *. A concluſion, therefore, in which they will all agree, muſt be thus expreſſed: *Pædobaptiſm is lawful.* Or, *There is no evil in baptizing infants.* If you puſh for a general concluſion one ſtep further than this, they vary in their judgment; they divide; they quarrel among themſelves. I cannot forbear obſerving, however, in the words of a great genius; "How happy it is to have to do with people that will talk *pro* and *con!* By this means you furniſh me with all I wanted, which was to make you *confute yourſelves* †".

What, now, can be the reaſon of this aſtoniſhing difference among the Pædobaptiſts, concerning their common cauſe? Pardon me, Reader, if I ſhould anſwer; Becauſe they all differ, in that affair, from the word of God. For, as Dr. BEATTIE obſerves, "They who allow themſelves to contradict matter of fact, either in converſation or writing, will find it no eaſy matter to avoid contradicting *themſelves* ‡:" and it will be morally impoſſible for them to avoid contradicting *one another*. The Scripture being profoundly ſilent about Infant baptiſm, they are obliged to argue in its defence, from *general* principles and *moral* conſiderations; from notions of *expediency*, *fitneſs*, and *utility*, to the adminiſtration of a *poſitive* appointment. Thus uniting in one common miſtake, they depart from the true nature of the ſubject about which they inquire.

* *Obſervat. Sac.* Tom. I. L. II. C. VI. § 9.

† Mr. PASCAL's *Letters relating to the Jeſuits*, Vol. II. Lett. XV.

‡ *Eſſay on Truth*, Part II. p. 170. Note. Edit. 1.

quire. For that ſubject is a *poſitive* rite; the *whole being* of which, and all its legitimate connections, depend on the ſovereign pleaſure of God. Now, though *moral* duty may be fairly argued, from general principles and moral conſiderations, that lie at a great diſtance from the particular caſe which is to be proved; and though the ſame *natural* duty may be inferred from a thouſand texts of Scripture, where that particular duty is not mentioned, and of which the inſpired Writers had no thought, when penning thoſe texts; yet the caſe is widely different, when a *ritual* duty is the ſubject of diſcuſſion. For *then* we have nothing at all to guide our inquiries, beſides *poſitive law* and the *example* of inſpired men, relating to the matter of inveſtigation. To ſuch precepts and precedents, therefore, we muſt adhere, or perpetually wander in a maze of uncertainty, and be continually differing one from another. Becauſe, as Bp. BURNET juſtly obſerves; "Though *lawful* and *unlawful* are ſevere and rigorous things, and of a fixed and determinate nature; yet *fit* and *unfit* are of a more looſe and unſtable order *." Common obſervation ſhews, that the ideas of men, concerning *expediency*, *fitneſs*, and *utility*, are extremely various: *theſe* eſteeming a ceremony proper and uſeful, which *thoſe* conſider as abſurd and injurious. It is no wonder, therefore, that the wiſeſt and beſt of Chriſtians, when reaſoning about a *poſitive* inſtitution on *moral* grounds, ſhould be thus divided, about the *eligibility* of arguments to ſupport their general hypotheſis; the *deſcription* of infants that ſhould be baptized; the *proper mode* of adminiſtration; and the *purpoſes* to be anſwered by it. See CHAP. I. and CHAP. IV. REFLECT. II.

REMARK III. It is, I think, apparent, that no *ritual*

* *Four Diſcourſes to the Clergy*, p. 350.

ritual divine appointment can be ſecure from groſs corruption, eſſential mutilation, or utter abolition, if *poſitive* law and *primitive* example be not ſtrictly regarded. If, by reaſoning on texts which do not ſpeak of the ordinance in queſtion, and by arguing on moral grounds, men be allowed to infer the right manner of its performance, its proper ſubjects, and its deſign; they have liberty to model the appointments of Chriſt juſt as they pleaſe. Whence originated the uſe of *ſponſors*, the *ſign of the croſs*, *anointing* the baptized perſon with oil, giving him *milk and honey*, his wearing a *white garment*, and *trine* immerſion, which ſo debaſed and corrupted baptiſm in the time of TERTULLIAN, but in reaſonings of this kind? Departing from the ſimplicity of poſitive divine law, and of apoſtolic practice, the venerable Ancients imagined ſuch additions to be expedient and uſeful; as being, in their opinion, ſilent lectures of moral inſtruction. On the ſame principle of utility, and by reaſoning on a text which does not ſpeak of the ſacred ſupper, *Infant communion* was firſt introduced, and is yet practiſed by a great part of the Chriſtian world. Thus the poſitive inſtitutions of Jeſus Chriſt, have been *metamorphoſed* and *corrupted* to the laſt degree, by this kind of reaſoning.—Caſt your eye on the Romiſh communion. There you behold an *eſſential mutilation* of the Lord's ſupper. On what kind of reaſonings was that outrage firſt committed upon poſitive law and primitive example; or, by what arguments is it now defended, except thoſe of a *moral* and *analogical* nature?—Thoſe alſo who defend the lawfulneſs of admitting perſons to the Lord's table, whom they conſider as *unbaptized*, proceed on the ſame principles. It is only on moral conſiderations, and by analogical reaſoning, that their novel conduct

duct obtains the ſhadow of a defence; becauſe, to a poſitive precept for it, or an apoſtolic example of it, the votaries of this innovation do not pretend*. —The

* As the laſt Author, who appeared in defence of this practice, was not contented with endeavouring to ſupport his cauſe in the common way; it may not be amiſs, perhaps, to make a few remarks on his conduct. As a Baptiſt, then, as a Diſſenter, and as a Proteſtant, he deſerts one of his own capital principles, in order to defend a darling hypotheſis; for, except it be maintained, that *poſitive* ordinances are to be intirely governed by *poſitive law* and *primitive example*, it is impoſſible for him to ſtand his ground by fair argument, in various caſes, when diſputing with Pædobaptiſts, as ſuch, with Conformiſts, or with Papiſts. But this principle he has abandoned, when ſupporting Free Communion: for he knew, and was obliged to acknowledge, that there is no *ritual* precept, nor any *apoſtolic* precedent, for it.—This, however, being nothing more than every advocate for that practice muſt confeſs, I ſhould not have taken any notice of it, had there not been ſomething of a much more dangerous tendency connected with it. Rather than fail to carry his point, he commits an act of high treaſon againſt *the majeſty of* ETERNAL TRUTH: by inſiſting, that there is "*no moral turpitude* in mental errors." By thus attacking the dignity and importance of Divine Truth, he encourages rebellion againſt her equitable and ſalutary claims, on the underſtandings, the conſciences, and the hearts of men. Nor does he ſcruple to palm his innocence of error on the Holy Spirit himſelf. For thus he ſpeaks: "There is, he [the *inſpired* Apoſtle] affirms, no moral turpitude in mental errors." *General Doct. of Tolerat.* p. 27. What, the inſpired PAUL affirm this, even while he maintains againſt ſome in the Corinthian church, that a certain mental error, unhappily adopted by them, inevitably inferred *the ſubverſion of all religion and of all hope*; and while he repeatedly pronounces an *awful anathema* on others, for publiſhing a mental error!

—The Socinians alſo, adopt a ſimilar courſe of argument, when they endeavour to ſet aſide baptiſm, except in particular caſes.—But, would you ſee in a yet

error! See 1 Cor. xv. 12—18. Gal. i. 6—9. If ſo, the Apoſtle was no leſs inconſiſtent with himſelf, than this patron of error, in the publication to which I advert. Among other things of a ſimilar kind, let the following poſitions be compared. "The candidate for fellowſhip, who has examined believers baptiſm by immerſion, and *cannot* obtain evidence of the truth of it, is indeed in a ſtate, in which his knowledge is imperfect: but this imperfection is innocent, becauſe he hath exerciſed ALL *the ability* and virtue he has—They [the Baptiſts] conſtantly affirmed, that the New Teſtament was a book *ſo plain*, and the religion of it *ſo eaſy*, that any man of common ſenſe *might underſtand it*, IF HE WOULD." *Gen Doct. of Tol.* p. 19. 43. Beſides, this author talks of TOLERATING his *perfectly* INNOCENT error: as if *innocence itſelf* were an object of *toleration!*

Our advocate for error ſeems to forget, that the ſentiment he defends is big with enmity to the neceſſity and the honour of divine Revelation; and that it ſo depreciates truth as to render it unworthy of a laborious inveſtigation. For, as *error* and *truth* are directly oppoſite, if the *former*, in any given inſtance, be quite harmleſs; the *latter*, in that inſtance, muſt be uſeleſs. And if error itſelf be innocent, all its genuine conſequences muſt be ſo too; for there cannot be evil in a natural and proper effect, if there was none in its real cauſe. But, is there no "moral turpitude" in forming falſe ideas of the perfections and character, of the government and grace of God? Is there nothing amiſs, in conceiving of the perſon and work of Chriſt, contrary to that revelation which is made of him? Is there not the leaſt harm, in taking that for a fact, which is a blaſphemous falſehood; or that for a falſehood, which is an important fact? Is nobody guilty before God, in regard to his mental operations, but he who encourages thoughts, pertaining to religion or morals, which he

knows

a yet ſtronger light, the powerful energy of drawing concluſions, in oppoſition to poſitive precepts and original precedent, from principles of the moral kind?

knows to be wrong? Or, have erroneous thoughts concerning God, his laws, or his goſpel, no *practical* tendency? Have they no influence at all, on the conſcience, the will, or the conduct?—Let me illuſtrate the point. We will ſuppoſe a perſon to be the moſt reſpectable character in Europe, for ſtrict integrity, deep humility, and unfeigned gratitude, whenever he receives a kindneſs. We will imagine, however, notwithſtanding theſe amiable virtues, that certain individuals, who think themſelves qualified to form an eſtimate of his character, are under ſuch a miſtake, as to think him guilty, of deteſtable duplicity, of inſolent pride, and of ſhocking ingratitude. Now, ſuch a judgment being paſſed in their own minds, and being quite ſerious in it, they foſter a *mental error:* yet this error, great as it is, reſpects only the moral character of a ſinful mortal. I demand, then, whether this advocate for error, if by any means the miſtake in queſtion came to his knowledge, would acquit it of all "moral turpitude," and from having a bad practical tendency? We may venture to conclude, that, were he *himſelf* the perſon on whoſe character ſuch a mental miſtake fixed the ſevere cenſure, he would *feel.*—We ſhall now take it for granted, that many capital errors reſpecting religion, are only ſo many miſtakes about the *moral character* of the Moſt High. That character being conſummately perfect, every miſrepreſentation of it muſt detract from its excellence. The Supreme character, therefore, is *degraded* by ſuch error; becauſe it is repreſented to be, what it *is not.* Conſequently, a mental error concerning God's moral character, is a mental *ſlander* upon that character. In proportion therefore, to the greatneſs of thoſe miſtakes which have the character of God for their object, muſt be their ſtrongly pernicious tendency, on the conſcience, the heart, and the life of him who is under them.

Hence

kind? contemplate the diſciples of GEORGE FOX. They, you know, have long rejected baptiſm and the holy ſupper, as temporary and carnal things: nor

Hence the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the ENERGY *of error*, (ενεργειαν πλανης) when characterizing ſome that were conſigned over to final ruin; *becauſe they received not* THE LOVE OF THE TRUTH. 2 Theſſ. ii. 10, 11.

Were this Gentleman's doctrine concerning the innocence of error worthy of regard, we might conſider the conduct of Pilate, who aſked, *What is truth?* but waited not for an anſwer, as deſerving of imitation, rather than cenſure. For though philoſophers talk about the *beauty* of truth; though theologians diſpute about the *articles* of truth; though inſpired Writers unite in diſplaying the *glory* of truth; and though the Son of God became incarnate, that he might *bear witneſs* to the truth; yet, after all, this very truth deſerves not a ſerious inquiry. A ſentiment this, which becomes none but a Sceptic. Perſons of that character have laboured to ſink the value of truth, and to exculpate error from every hateful charge; but that a Chriſtian *miniſter*, ſhould boldly aſſert, and hold it as a kind of theological axiom, that *mental error has no moral turpitude in it*, is very extraordinary! Candour, indeed, compels us to think, that the Author on whom we animadvert, did not *intend* to ſap the foundation on which every ſolid vindication of the Bible againſt Infidels muſt reſt; but allegiance to the ſupremacy of Divine Truth requires, that the innocence of error ſhould be abjured, as *abſurd* in itſelf, and as *deiſtical* in its natural tendency.—That hardened Infidel, Mr. DAVID HUME, when addreſſing the Deity, ſpeaks agreeably to this obſervation. His language is; "What mortals term *ſin*, thou pronounceſt to be only *error*, [and *innocent*, we may be ſure;] for *moral* evil vaniſhes, in ſome meaſure, from before thy more perfect ſight." In Dr. WITHERSPOON's *Eſſays*, Vol. I. p. 60. 2d Edit.—Here we may add a remark from Dr. WITHERSPOON, who ſpeaks as

nor do they endeavour to defend the abolition of thoſe inſtitutions, except on *moral* grounds.

Once more: Nothing is more expreſſly or awfully condemned, than the conduct of Jeroboam, reſpecting his innovations. Yet, had he been allowed the privilege of pleading his own cauſe on *moral*

follows. "Though Infidels always ſet out on a pretence of ſearching impartially after truth; yet they have unanimouſly agreed in putting truth and error intirely on the ſame footing, both as to worth and influence." *Ibid.* p. 95. How far the following obſervation, from the ſame ſenſible writer, will juſtly apply to the Gentleman of whom I take notice, is left with the Reader. "If freedom of inquiry be a bleſſing at all, it can be ſo for no other reaſon than the excellence and ſalutary influence of real truth, when it can be diſcovered. If truth and error are equally ſafe, nothing can be more fooliſh, than for a man to waſte his time in endeavouring to diſtinguiſh the one from the other. What a view does it give us of the weakneſs of human nature, that the ſame perſons ſo frequently hold inconſiſtent principles? How many will ſay the *ſtrongeſt things* in favour of an impartial ſearch after truth, and with the very ſame breath tell you, *It is of no conſequence at all, either for time or eternity, whether you hold one opinion, or another.*" Ut ſupra, *Advertiſement*, p. 4, 5.

Should our Pleader for the innocence of error condeſcend to read theſe few ſtrictures upon him, I have the conſolation to think, that he cannot condemn any part of them, as tinctured with *moral* turpitude, without confirming my argument, and confronting his favourite principle. For, ſuppoſing he find a miſtake in this long Note, it is nothing but *mental error* tranſmitted to public view, by the *pen*, the *paper*, and the *preſs*. It was all in my own *mind*, before it appeared on paper—in a mind, I will add, that has thought on the ſubject; that has, in ſome degree, ſtudied the ſubject; and ſincerely believes theſe animadverſions juſt.

As,

moral grounds, and from hiſtorical facts which did not refer to the ſubject in queſtion, impartiality itſelf muſt have acquitted him. This, if I miſtake not, the learned AINSWORTH has proved in a maſterly manner. That celebrated author, when exploding the Popiſh idolatry, detecting the artifices of its deluded votaries, and maintaining the prerogative

As, therefore, the pen, the paper, and the preſs, were never accuſed of any bad intention, being all harmleſs things; and as this Gentleman himſelf has undertaken the patronage of error, conſidered as *mental*; I muſt be acquitted by him of *moral* guilt, whatever offences againſt the laws of politeneſs, or the canons of literature, he may lay to my charge. Nay, I rejoice in the proſpect of ſomething more than a bare acquittal from moral turpitude; I expect his *thanks:* and, that the Reader may not imagine I form ſuch a high expectation without any ground, I will produce my warrant for it. You muſt know, then, that my claim is founded on the following generous declaration: "The man who undertakes to correct one's miſtakes does one A GREAT HONOUR. He remonſtrates in hope of reclaiming, but before he can hope to reclaim, he muſt preſuppoſe all thoſe *amiable diſpoſitions* which enable a man to ſay, I AM MISTAKEN." *Arcana*, Lett. I. p. 14. Now, as I have done him that *ſingular honour* of which he ſpeaks, it would be very ungenerous and very unjuſt, were he to wince and be offended with me for it. Fluſhed, therefore, with hopes that this tax on his gratitude will be cheerfully paid; I ſhall, at preſent reſt contented, without attempting to lay his generoſity under any further obligation. I cannot help wiſhing, however, that ſome able writer would *thoroughly* examine the innocence of error, and a few other particulars contained in this Gentleman's publications. Nor is there any reaſon, that I can diſcern, why he ſhould not be *loaded* with honour, by having his miſtakes corrected: eſpecially as he appears diſpoſed to make all ſuitable returns for ſuch a kindneſs.

rogative of God in oppoſition to their ſophiſtry; repreſents the apoſtate ſon of Nebat as thus addreſſing the ten tribes, in order to quiet their minds and conciliate their eſteem, while he gave his royal ſanction to outrageous violations of Jehovah's poſitive laws. "I ſee my courſe, O men of Iſrael, to be much ſuſpected, if not wholly miſliked, of many; ſome thinking my ceremonies to ſavour too rankly of Heathen ſuperſtition; ſome charging plainly with flat apoſtacy and forſaking of God. But——the alteration that I have made, is in matters of *circumſtance*, things merely ceremonial, whereof there is no *expreſs*, certain, or permanent law given us of God; and which are variable, as *time*, *place*, and *perſon*, give occaſion, and ſuch as good kings have changed before me, and have been blameleſs.

"And, firſt, for the *place*, where God is to be worſhipped, which many now would have at *Jeruſalem* only, I find the practice of our patriarch Abraham, and the Fathers following, to be far otherwiſe. They ſacrificed to God, as occaſion was offered, in every place they came;—ſo this ſuperſtition of tying God to *one* place, was not hatched in their days. After this, when our Fathers came out of Egypt, they offered ſacrifices in the wilderneſs; and, being come into this land, in how ſundry places of it have they ſerved God?—And ſhall we now grow ſo ſuperſtitious, as to bind God to any *one* place? Nay, this is all the Lord's land, and his eyes are in every part of the ſame; and it is not ſo material *where* we do worſhip, as *whom* we do worſhip, and with *what affection*; for our God is *near*, in all times and places, to all that call upon him in truth.

"But, it will be ſaid, That *Jeruſalem* is the place which God hath choſen; promiſing unto Solomon, to put

put his name in the temple there for ever, and that his eyes and his heart ſhould be there perpetually. I anſwer; The promiſe and covenant was *conditional*, if God's ſtatutes and judgments were obſerved: for if they ſhould turn away, and ſerve other gods, God ſaid he would caſt out of his ſight that houſe which he had hallowed for his name—And ſee we not, how Solomon forfeited his bond? His wives turned his heart after other gods;—for which his wickedneſs God was angry, and hath rent his kingdom from his ſon, and gave it to me——And now, that this *Bethel*, where I build a houſe to our God, is the place which he hath choſen to dwell therein, we may boldly ſay—They boaſt, in Jeruſalem, how their temple ſtandeth upon mount Morijah, where Abraham our father offered his ſon Iſaac (a type of the Meſſiah) for a ſacrifice to God: we alſo can glory, how Jacob our patriarch ſaw in this our place, a ladder that reached from earth to heaven, by which the angels of God went up and down; a type alſo, doubtleſs, of our Meſſiah—Here God appeared to our father Jacob, promiſing him the land, and heirs to poſſeſs it: he then acknowledged how the Lord was in this reverend place; that it was no other but the houſe of God, and the very gate of heaven; and thereupon gave it a new name, *Bethel, God's houſe*—To go to Jeruſalem, it may prove perilous: ſure, it is overmuch for the people that dwell afar off, and ſeemeth to me altogether unreaſonable. For may and ought not every prince and people, to ſerve God in their *own country?* Was there any before me that might not do it? and am I more in bondage than all? Beſides, who knoweth not the grudge that Rehoboam hath againſt us?—He counteth me and my people *rebels*; and if he can get me within his dominion, he will ſurely cut

cut off my head, and the heads of many more. And doth God, who *deſireth mercy rather than ſacrifice*, require of men thus to run upon the ſword's point, and endanger their lives without cauſe, and only for a circumſtance of *place!* I am not ſo weak of judgment at to think it; neither will I be ſo unwiſe, as to hearken to thoſe Levites who kindle a fire of contention among my ſubjects, and teach that we all muſt go up to Jeruſalem, or elſe we may offer no ſacrifice to God. Believe them that liſt: I have otherwiſe learned the truth of the law; and truſt we ſhall ſo ſerve the Lord at home, as will pleaſe him well enough.

"For the worſhip that here we perform unto God, is, for the *ſubſtance*, the ſame that himſelf commanded by Moſes. We ſerve the ſame GOD that brought us up out of the land of Egypt; and this is the firſt and great commandment, on which all other do depend—We hold the main article of our Meſſiah to come—If here it be ſaid, we do againſt God, in making theſe golden figures, becauſe he forbiddeth graven images to be made; the anſwer is eaſy. God's meaning is, not to forbid all images ſimply; but only *idols*, that have divine worſhip done unto them—Yet ſome—think, that I give the honour to them, that is due to the eternal and bleſſed God himſelf—But, were I ſo minded, I ſhould be, indeed, more brutiſh than a calf myſelf.——Theſe prieſts of Levi are much to be pitied, that urge ſo the letter of the law, which I think they underſtand not. They ſay it is written, *Ye ſhall put nothing to the word that I command you, nor take aught therefrom:* but they mind not how this intendeth matters of *faith*, and doctrines *fundamental*, which I willingly grant may in no wiſe be corrupted; but *ceremonies* are variable, and circumſtances may be changed upon every juſt occaſion

occaſion——The prophet that came out of Judah to Bethel, and gave there a ſign, made ſome for to think, I had ſinned indeed. Myſelf, I confeſs, was ſomewhat moved, when I felt my arm withered; but ſeriouſly weighing things after, as they were, I ſtayed my thoughts. For—I find, in the law, that a prophet may ariſe, giving a ſign or wonder, which ſhall come to paſs; and yet his doctrine may be abominable, and God thereby proveth the hearts of his people. The enchanters of Egypt could alſo do miracles, even like unto Moſes; yet were they no miniſters of the Lord—The abuſe of God's name cannot go long unpuniſhed; for it is a great ſin: neither ſcaped this prophet due vengeance for his crime, but, as he went homeward, he was ſlain by a lion. Well worthy end for ſuch as diſſemble the meſſage of the Moſt High! However, therefore, ſome think of this matter, I am not perſuaded he was a man of God that came to ſo fearful a death.

"But the death of mine own ſon, Abijah, ſat nearer me, and made me look narrowly into mine actions, till I found, indeed, whereof to reſolve. I ſent mine own wife to Ahijah the Prophet for counſel about him: but the choleric old man would not ſuffer her to ſpeak, but, breaking out into heat and menaces, gave her anſwer before ſhe aſked. It is eaſy to ſee his partial affection: he leaneth towards Judah, and ſpeaketh with bitterneſs againſt me, that never did him hurt—My ſon is dead and gone; for his day was come. If he were cut off before his time, it was rather for his vice, than for his virtue. The prophet ſaid, there was *ſome goodneſs found in my ſon towards the Lord God of Iſrael*; and, therefore, he muſt *die*. But doth the Lord

uſe

uſe ſo to reward them that are good before him? It is ſaid, in the Scripture, of wicked men, *that they ſhall not live out half their days:* yet, now, this young man's death is brought as an argument to prove he was *godly!* Ahijah, I perceive, is too old to be a ſeer any longer; elſe could he not have been ſo much overſeen in this new doctrine. God's law biddeth children *honour their parents, that their days may be long in the land*; but this my child had his days ſhortened, doubtleſs, for diſobedience. My other ſons conſented to that which I did about religion; and they live and proſper. He only would be more preciſe than his brethren, and his honour is laid in the duſt. Thus I ſee in my houſe the proverb fulfilled; *The fear of the Lord increaſeth the days; but the years of the wicked ſhall be diminiſhed* *."

By this abſtract of the maſterly mock apology which the famous Puritan makes for the conduct of Jeroboam, it plainly appears; That, as thoſe general principles on which human legiſlation proceeds, whenever it dares to preſcribe how God ſhall be worſhipped, are much *the ſame* in every age and nation; ſo, when human appointments in the affairs of religion are called in queſtion, they muſt be defended, if defended at all, on the ſame *general grounds*. Yes, whether it be an aſſembly of preſbyters, or a council of prelates; whether it be the injunction of a pope, or the mandate of a prince, by which the inventions of men are incorporated with the appointments of God; they admit of the ſame kind of defence. For the eſpouſers of them will always be forced to ſtand on ſimilar ground with Nebat's apoſtate

* *Arrow againſt Idolatry*, Chap. III. p. 45---65. See alſo JOSEPHUS's *Antiq. of the Jews*, Book VIII. Chap. III. and Dr. JENNINGS's *Jewiſh Antiq.* Vol. II. p. 26, 27, 28.

tate ſon.—It further appears, by this extract from AINSWORTH, that the moſt deteſtable corruptions of ritual worſhip, admit of a *plauſible* defence, when managed by perſons of genius, if you do but allow them the privilege of arguing on *general* principles, as diſtinguiſhed from poſitive laws, and on ſuch paſſages of ſacred Writ as are *foreign* to the ſubject in queſtion. It certainly behoves us, therefore, to be exceedingly careful of deſerting *poſitive law* and *primitive example*, when a ritual ordinance is under conſideration; ſeeing, this apology for Jeroboam defies the art of man to confute it, on any other ground.

REMARK IV. Before I conclude, I would preſent the Reader with a plain popular argument, which, among many others, has been uſed with great propriety and force againſt the Church of Rome. The anonymous author of a little book which is called, *Popery confuted by Papiſts*; gives the laſt Section of his work the following title: "Proving, by the confeſſion of all ſides, that the Proteſtant religion is *ſafer*; becauſe, in all poſitive points of doctrine, the Romaniſts themſelves *agree* with them, [the Proteſtants] but in their additions, they ſtand *ſingle* by themſelves." Then he proceeds to mention particulars in the following manner. "We ſay, there is a heaven and a hell. It is true, ſay they; but there is alſo *a purgatory*—We ſay, we ſhall be ſaved by the merits and ſatisfaction of Chriſt Jeſus. It is true, ſay they; but there are likewiſe merits and ſatisfactions of *our own*—We ſay, the ſacraments of baptiſm and the euchariſt, are two proper ſacraments, inſtituted by Chriſt. It is true, ſay they; but there are *five more* to be received,"—and ſo on. Why, now, may not we adopt a ſimilar method? There is no ſufficient reaſon, that I perceive,

perceive, to forbid our proceeding thus: We aſſert, that poſitive inſtitutions depend intirely on the ſovereign will of God. It is true, ſay our Pædobaptiſt Brethren; and cenſure the Papiſts for preſuming to alter them. We maintain, that the term *baptiſm*, properly ſignifies *immerſion*. It is true, ſay they; but, many of them add, it alſo ſignifies waſhing, where there is no immerſion. We contend, that the grand facts repreſented by the ordinance, cannot be ſo well expreſſed by pouring or ſprinkling, as by immerſion. It is true, ſay they; but ſprinkling was a Jewiſh method of purification, nor is it deſtitute of analogy. We inſiſt upon it, that immerſion was the apoſtolic practice. It is true, ſay they; but there are difficulties in the way of conceiving that it was always uſed. We aſſert, that immerſion is now practiſed by one half the Chriſtian world, and that it was, except in extraordinary caſes, the general practice for thirteen centuries. It is true, ſay they; yet pouring, or ſprinkling, may ſuffice in theſe northern climates. We maintain, that there is no expreſs command, nor plain example, for Infant baptiſm in the ſacred Scripture. It is true, ſay they; but it may be inferred from Gen. xvii. Ezek. xvi. and from various parts of the New Teſtament. We contend, that there is no ſolid evidence of Pædobaptiſm being practiſed at all, before the end of the ſecond Century; and that it was not a prevailing cuſtom, before the middle of the third Century. It is true, ſay they; but yet we think it our duty, at leaſt, it cannot be unlawful, to baptize infants. We inſiſt upon it, that Infant communion is hoary with high antiquity, recommended by general practice for a courſe of ages, and is now the cuſtom of one half the Chriſtian world. It is all true, ſay they; but yet infants have no claim on the

the ſacred ſupper, though they are intitled to baptiſm. Finally; Do we ſolemnly immerſe thoſe who profeſs faith in the Son of God? they cannot, they dare not deny, that we have divine authority for it.

The Reader will now judge, from the foregoing pages, whether this be a fair ſtate of the caſe; and if it be, I appeal to him, whether ours be not the *ſafer* ſide of the queſtion. That every one ſhould chooſe the ſafer ſide, in the Pædobaptiſt, as well as the Popiſh controverſy, is a dictate of *common prudence*; and her authority muſt not be confronted by any thing ſhort of divine Revelation. Having, however, of late been fond, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, of adorning my page and ſupporting my cauſe by atteſtations from the writings of our oppoſers; I ſhall introduce another quotation, and that from one who never played booty, when diſputing with Baptiſts. The author to whom I refer, is the celebrated Mr. BAXTER. "Methinks men, ſays he, ſhould deſire to go on the *ſurer* ſide of the hedge; and, ſeeing, where there is no law, there is no tranſgreſſion, ſin being nothing elſe but a tranſgreſſion of the law; they ſhould conclude, That it is certainly no ſin, and therefore *ſafeſt*, to let go thoſe additions which no law enjoineth. But, on the other ſide, That it may be a *dangerous* ſin to uſe them; both as being an accuſation of Scripture, as *inſufficient*, and as *adding* to God's worſhip. If, when his worſhip was ſo much ceremonious, he yet layeth a charge to do whatever he commanded, and add nothing thereto, nor take aught therefrom: (that is, not *to* or *from*, the *words commanding* only, but alſo the *work commanded)* is it likely, then, that he will be leſs jealous in this now *?"—

Suppoſing

* *Plain Script. Proof.* p. 303.

Suppoſing a Quaker, who may be conſidered as quite impartial in this diſpute, were choſen by us and our Brethren, as a referee, to determine which ſide is the *ſafer*; ſuppoſing him to hear what is *alleged* by us, and what is *granted* by them; what would he ſay? It is likely, I think, his language would be to the following import: "Neighbours, ye are *all* wrong. But, if I muſt give my opinion, according to the principles adopted by both parties, I cannot help thinking, that, as my Pædobaptiſt neighbours are obliged to make *ſo many* and *great conceſſions* to their oppoſers; and as the Baptiſts have the *letter* of Scripture and *primitive* practice much in their favour; theirs muſt be conſidered as the *ſafer ſide*." It is, however, ſufficiently plain, that if ROBERT BARCLAY had been our umpire in the affair, this would have been his unbiaſſed award; as appears by quotations already produced from him.

REMARK V. Baptiſm being an appointment of Chriſt, and a branch of religious worſhip, ſhould ever be viewed as an evidence of our Lord's divine authority, as a fruit of his conſummate wiſdom, and as an expreſſion of his immenſe goodneſs. Thus conſidered, its deſign muſt be gracious, and of a practical tendency. Now it appears, from CHAPTER III. that many Pædobaptiſts agree with us in maintaining, that it was chiefly intended to repreſent our communion with its great Inſtitutor, in his death, burial, and reſurrection. All, therefore, that have been baptized on a profeſſion of faith, ſhould endeavour to live under a *practical* ſenſe of thoſe duties and bleſſings to which it directs their attention, and to which they expreſſed a ſolemn regard when they were baptized. To ſuch an improvement of this inſtitution the Apoſtle exhorts, in Rom. vi. 1—5. Nothing is more agreeable

than

than to ſuppoſe, that a reception of baptiſm ſhould be calculated to promote the exerciſe of thoſe diſpoſitions, hopes, and views, which qualify a candidate for it. So, for inſtance, if nothing ſhort of really believing on Jeſus Chriſt, can be a ſufficient ground of profeſſing faith in him; and if ſuch a profeſſion be required previous to baptiſm; then, certainly, each baptized perſon ſhould conſtantly aim at *living* by faith, as a characteriſtic of thoſe who are truly righteous. Habitually regarding *the blood of Chriſt*, not the baptiſmal water, as *cleanſing from all ſin*; and the obedience of our great Subſtitute, not a ſubmiſſion to this ordinance, as that righteouſneſs by which he is juſtified; he may be ſaid, in the language of inſpiration, to *live by the faith of the Son of God*.—And as every candidate, properly qualified for the ſacred rite, ſolemnly avows the authority of Chriſt, and a ſincere deſire of living in ſubjection to him, as Lord of conſcience and King in Zion; ſo, when baptized, he ſhould often reflect on that avowal, with earneſt prayer, that the holy diſpoſitions he then felt may increaſe and operate with all their force. Thus adverting to the doctine of Scripture concerning baptiſm, he finds it rich with encouragement for *hope*, and big with exhortation to *duty*. The *former*, becauſe it preſents to his view, the dying, the intombed, the riſing Redeemer; on whoſe glorious Perſon and complete work, his hope of acceptance with God is founded. Yes, adverting to this inſtitution, he is reminded that Chriſt died, was buried, and roſe again; yet not for his own emolument, but for the guilty, the wretched, the damnable: while, feeling his want and confeſſing his unworthineſs, he hopes, rejoices, and bows at the feet of his adorable Sponſor.—The *latter*, becauſe it emphatically cries in his ear, *How*

ſhall

ſhall we, who profeſſed in our baptiſm to be *dead to ſin, live any longer therein?* Was Chriſt *raiſed from the dead, by the glory of the Father*, to a life of ſublime honour and perfect happineſs; and ſhall not we alſo *live in newneſs of life?* When tempted by Satan, or ſolicited by mortals, to defile his conſcience and offend the Lord; a ſerious reflection upon his baptiſm will cauſe him to ſay, *How ſhall I do this great evil and ſin againſt God*, whom, in my baptiſmal profeſſion, I engaged to ſerve?

Nor is the doctrine of baptiſm, rightly underſtood, leſs fitted to detect the artifice of ſeveral capital errors, as Paul teaches, 1 Cor. xv. 29. Does, for inſtance, the Socinian denial of our Lord's real and proper atonement, ſolicit the believer's reception? He recurs to his baptiſm, and, after the example of an Apoſtle, he aſks; "If there be no atonement for ſin, by the blood of Chriſt, why was I baptized in token of my *communion* with him in his death? If he did not ſuffer and bleed as a ſubſtitute for ſinners, what part can baptiſm repreſent me as having in *his* death, any more than in the martyrdom of Peter? If there be no atonement for ſin, why was the moſt holy Lamb of God immerſed in the torrent of eternal juſtice, and plunged in the moſt bitter death? And why are we baptized at all *into his* DEATH, if not as a memorial of his being *made a curſe*, and falling a victim to divine juſtice, *for us?*"——Again: Does the Sabellian, the Arian, or the Socinian hypotheſis, relating to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, preſent itſelf to the Chriſtian's notice? He ſtill recurs to his baptiſm, and aſks; "Into *what*, or *whom*, was I baptized? Into the name of *a name*, or into the name of three *offices?* Far be it, that I ſhould entertain ſuch an abſurdity!—Into the name of GOD, and of two *exalted creatures?* Abhorred be the

the thought, that creatures ſhould be joint objects with the Creator, in any act of religious worſhip! What! ſhall creatures, who cannot but owe their being to divine power and their bleſſedneſs to divine favour, be thus aſſociated with Eternal Majeſty, and thus adored with the Great Supreme! The firſt command of the law, and the firſt dictate of reaſon, in reference to God and creatures, forbid the idolatrous abſurdity. Was it by placing *dependence* on the throne of ALLSUFFICIENCY, by treating ſubjects as on a level with their Sovereign, and by worſhipping thoſe who, on this hypotheſis, muſt be *worſhippers*, that I commenced my public profeſſion? deteſted be ſuch imaginations, as no leſs inſulting to the human underſtanding, than contradictory to divine Revelation!—Into what, or whom, then, was I baptized? Into the name of GOD, of a *man*, and of a *property?* What an heterogeneous aſſociation of ideas! A *Divine* Perſon, a merely *human* perſon, and ſomething divine which is *not* a perſon! Was I baptized on the united authority of *theſe?* Or, was my ſubmitting to baptiſm an act of obedience to *a man*, like myſelf, and to an unintelligent *property*, equally as to the FATHER? Did I then profeſs, not by a parent, or by a proxy, but *perſonally* and *ſolemnly* profeſs, my dependence on a mere *man*, my ſubjection to his authority, and my deſire of living to his praiſe? No! I then ſolemnly acknowledged, I then profoundly adored, the FATHER, and the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, as the THREE *who bear record in heaven*, and yet are but *one* God. My baptiſm teaches, that this part of my creed is of the laſt importance; and, therefore, through the aids of grace, I will abide by it."—This may ſerve as a ſpecimen of that practical improvement which believers are called to make of their

their baptiſm,—*that* baptiſm, which was adminiſtered at their own requeſt, on a conviction of duty and in hope of a bleſſing.

And now, Reader, are *you* a baptized perſon? Have you profeſſed faith in the Son of God, and been immerſed in the name of the Eternal Trinity? Reflect, then, on what your baptiſm teaches, and on what your ſolemn profeſſion demands. Make it your daily buſineſs to improve your baptiſmal profeſſion in the beſt manner.—Perhaps you are one of thoſe who call themſelves, Baptiſts *in ſentiment*, but are not yet baptized. If ſo, I beg leave to inquire, why not a Baptiſt *in practice?* Is it becauſe you are conſcious of not being fit for the ordinance? You are, it may be, dead in ſin, and have only an educational knowledge of this inſtitution. Should that be your caſe, you have reaſon to tremble every moment. Unfit for baptiſm you are, indeed; and equally unfit for heaven. Your ſoul, your everlaſting all, is at ſtake, and God only knows what will become you.—But, peradventure, you are not careleſs about your immortal intereſts; you hear the goſpel with attention, read the Bible with prayer, examine with great anxiety the ſtate of your ſoul, and yet, after all, a painful ſuſpicion prevails, that you are not a partaker of regenerating grace. If ſo, I would take the liberty of ſuggeſting a hint for your direction, from that remarkable diſtinction which the beloved Apoſtle makes, between *fathers*, *young men*, and *little children*. You are pained, it may be, becauſe you cannot find the marks of a *father*, while you ought rather to be thankful for thoſe of a *little child*; that is, of a young, or a feeble convert. Now it is plain, from the tenour of apoſtolic practice, that baptiſm, and the holy ſupper, were intended for the weakeſt of real diſciples: for we have

have ſcarcely an inſtance, in the New Teſtament, of baptiſm being adminiſtered, without being informed that the perſons baptized were but juſt before converted.—You are *afraid*, or *aſhamed*, perhaps, of the deſpiſed immerſion; and that is the reaſon you have never deſired to partake of the ordinance. Afraid! aſhamed! of what? The *chill* of the water? The *ſneer* of your fellow worms? If either fear, or ſhame, had been allowed thus to operate in the boſom of Abraham, when hoary with age, he would never have ſubmitted to that command; *Ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreſkin.* If ſelfiſh and ſervile paſſions prevent your obeying an appointment of Chriſt, you deſerve the ſevereſt cenſure: for our Lord himſelf has declared, *He that is aſhamed of me and of my word, of him will I be aſhamed.*—You reply, it may be, "It is not *eſſential.*" Eſſential, to what? Your pardon, or juſtification? by no means. But is not a prevailing diſpoſition to obey the authority of Chriſt, eſſential to true *holineſs?* and is not holineſs eſſential to real *happineſs?* Whatever confidence, therefore, you may pretend in the mercy of God, your trifling with divine authority in this manner, is a ſufficient reaſon for the moſt painful doubts concerning your ſtate. To what purpoſe confeſs yourſelf a Baptiſt in ſentiment, while, though free from harraſſing fear about your converſion, you neglect the ordinance? To what purpoſe, did I aſk? your own conduct replies; To expoſe your want of integrity, in regard to ſacred things—To let others know, that your conſcience, in this reſpect, is not under the controul of him whom you call your LORD—And to declare that, in reſpect of baptiſm, you think yourſelf wiſer than he; becauſe you treat as unimportant, and inexpedient, what you cannot but acknowledge he has required.—You

are a Baptiſt in *ſentiment*. Well, but what would people think, were you to ſay, "I am a *Diſſenter*, in ſentiment; and an *honeſt man*, in ſentiment?" Think, why they would certainly conſider you, as an *hypocrite*, in religion; and as a *knave*, in moral conduct.

REMARK VI. In what light our Pædobaptiſt Brethren, who may condeſcend to peruſe the foregoing pages, will conſider the courſe of argumentation contained in them, I cannot determine: there is no doubt, however, but many objections will ariſe in their minds againſt it. This, there is reaſon to conclude, would have been the caſe, had the arguments produced in oppoſition to Infant ſprinkling been far more numerous, and much more cogent, than thoſe with which the Reader is here preſented. Such, in a particular manner, as labour under violent prejudices, will be ſure to object: becauſe, as Dr. DODDRIDGE obſerves, "There is hardly any argument in favour of truth, from which a prejudiced and captious wit cannot draw an objection, and frame a ſophiſtry to maintain error *." Far be it, notwithſtanding, from any to imagine, that this is intended as an impeachment of the good ſenſe, the integrity, or the piety, of thoſe who differ from us in regard to the mode and ſubject of baptiſm, while we have fellowſhip with them in the moſt capital truths of divine Revelation. No; a difference of judgment and practice concerning this part of religious duty, may be accounted for by conſidering the powerful influence which long eſtabliſhed cuſtoms have on our modes of thinking and acting, without indulging a ſuſpicion which is both unfriendly and unwarrantable. Beſides, though the author of this Treatiſe has freely examined the grounds

* *On* Acts xxviii. 23. *Note.*

grounds of Infant ſprinkling, and plainly ſhewn his cordial diſapprobation of them; he has a ſincere and high eſteem for great numbers of Pædobaptiſts, as his Brethren in the Lord; not only among the Diſſenters, but alſo in the National Eſtabliſhment: while there are others, of his own perſuaſion in reſpect to *baptiſm*, with whom he has no fellowſhip, and for whom he has no regard, except in the exerciſe of that juſtice, and in the expreſſions of that benevolence, which are due to all mankind.

Having examined Pædobaptiſm according to the plan at firſt propoſed, a remarkable declaration of Bp. TAYLOR's occurs to remembrance. The declaration to which I refer, was made by him when taking a retroſpect of the arguments uſually produced on both ſides of this diſpute, and is as follows. "I think there is *ſo much* to be pretended againſt that [Pædobaptiſm] which I believe to be the truth, that there is much more *truth* than *evidence* on our ſide *." Reflecting on this language of the learned prelate, I am pleaſed, I am puzzled, I am diſcouraged. I am *pleaſed*, *greatly* pleaſed, to hear a perſon of the biſhop's erudition and penetration acknowledge, that *much*, *ſo* much may be ſaid againſt Infant baptiſm. I am yet *more* pleaſed to hear him tacitly confeſs, that *greatly preponderating* evidence is on our ſide.—I am puzzled, however, *extremely* puzzled. For I cannot imagine how the right reverend prelate, notwithſtanding all his learning and all his acumen, diſcovered *truth* without *evidence*. This, it muſt be confeſſed, was a wonderful ſecret; and he would certainly have laid poſterity under great obligations, had he but made the *arcanum* public. Mankind might have reaped a harveſt of benefits from the diſcovery of ſuch an invention; becauſe it

* *Liberty of Propheſying*, Sect. XVIII. p. 245.

it would have been of admirable use in many a pinching case besides Pædobaptism, to which it is here applied. I am equally nonplused, when thinking of truth and evidence taking *opposite sides* of a controverted subject. Having never heard of any *quarrel* between them, either before or since the flood; I took it for granted that they were leagued in eternal friendship: whereas it now appears, on the word of a Bishop, that they cannot *agree* about Infant baptism.—This being the case, I am greatly *discouraged*, in respect of an issue to the present controversy. For, as truth and evidence do not depend on the will of man, they are stubborn things; and we may justly presume they will not easily quit their stations, out of complaisance to either side. While, therefore, each abides by her party, the Baptists, it is likely, will plead *preponderating evidence*, and firmly insist upon it as a maxim of logical prudence; That our *assent* should always be proportioned to the *degree of evidence* *. On the other hand, we need not wonder if Pædobaptists exult in the possession of *truth*, because it is a precious jewel; and such truth, especially, as is obtained *without evidence*, must be precious indeed, it being so extremely scarce. Despairing, therefore, of putting an end to any controversy where truth and evidence take different sides, I must here lay down my pen.

* Dr. WATTS's *Logick*, Part II. Chap. IV. Direct. VIII.

BRITISH 20 AP 36 MUSEUM

INDEX

INDEX

To Quotations from modern PÆDOBAPTIST *Authors, contained in the preceding pages.*

ALTINGIUS p. 19. 57. 88. 128. 135. 417.
Assembly of Divines 92. 334. 346.
Altmannus 97. 144.
Ames 334. 451.
A Lapide 59.
Alstedius 26. 126.
Arnoldus 325.
Ainsworth 468.
Articles of Smalcald 26.
Addington 31. 40. 72, 73. 191. 213. 338. 351. 363. 373.
Anonymous 26.
——— 78.
——— 416.
——— 359. 473.
——— 407.
Bingham 86. 205. 437.
Bentley 17.
Beza 17. 86.
Beckmanus 18. 317.
Bucanus 18. 47. 52.
Badbury 243.
Bower 83.
Burnet 3. 91. 136. 150. 155. 168. 318. 406. 419. 441. 460.
Baxter 47. 91. 117. 136. 169. 174. 182. 312. 315. 375. 453. 475.
Burmannus 19. 55. 86.
Bossuet 22. 93. 113. 153. 190.
Braunius 56. 75. 92.
Barrow 61. 317. 405.
Beattie 459.
Ball 296.
Brooke 181. 296. 380.
Bengelius 67. 76. 349. 390.
Butler 1.
Bailey 26.
Boys 50.
Burkit 51. 76. 82. 229. 348.
Bohemius, Johannes, 196.
Blackstone 36.
Boston 171. 184.
Blake 338. 370.
Beausobre 78.
Benson 253.
Bochartus 67.
Bacon 159.
Bellarminus 214.
Brandt 413.
Calvin 17. 81. 162. 316. 345. 366.
Claude 88. 175. 391.
Curcellæus 88. 195. 413.
Casaubonus 20.
Clarke 59. 127. 149. 296.
Charnock 34. 159. 167. 176. 313. 323. 354.
Cheyne 158.
Chillingworth 177. 421.

Cave

Cave 58. 92. 129.
Clerc, le, 95. 200.
Chamierus 98. 212.
Cocceius 62. 183. 356.
Chambers 94. 196. 332.
Caſtalio 53. 86.
Camerarius 86. 376.
Cameron 76. 316. 376.
Cajetanus 59. 80.
Cunæus 338.
Calovius 328. 341.
Chardin 161.
Conſtantinus 28.
Cawdry 171.
Davenant 50. 79.
Davies 17.
Daille 83. 211. 217. 444.
Doddridge 25, 94. 314. 349. 360. 373. 395. 401. 482.
Deylingius 24. 99. 133. 145. 209. 246. 259. 261. 358. 451.
Dorrington 256. 282.
Dutch Annotators 98.
Du Pin 202. 211.
D'Aſſigny 450.
Erſkine 151. 185. 298. 305. 346.
England, Church of, 57. 124. 152.
Eſtius 87. 127. 333.
Edwards, John, 61. 328. 404.
——— Jonathan, 3. 238. 267.
——— Dr. Jonathan, 31.
Eraſmus 171.
Ellis 175.
Encyclopædia Britannica 121. 140.
Ferguſon 324.
Formey 133. 195.
Foxe 114.
Fuller 168.
Floyer 90. 137. 157, 158.
Fouler 59.
Field 172.
Frankius 47.
Fabricius, F. 162. 341.
——— J. 207. 212.
Featley 228.
Fell 98.
Fulke 444.
Findlay 161.
Fiſher 178.
Goodwin 11. 47. 184. 32
Gurtlerus 16. 79.
Grotius 51. 74. 86. 135. 21
227. 256. 314.
Gataker 75. 359.
Gerhardus 335.
Groſvenor 4.
Gerard 14.
Gibſon 414.
Haſſelquiſt 121.
Helvetia, Confeſſion of, 8
124.
Hoornbeekius 19. 53. 8
135. 184. 315.
Hoſpinianus 20. 88. 22
409. 419.
Heideggerus 25. 60. 99. 12
150. 256. 356. 420.
Haſæus 90.
Heineccius 190.
Hammond 23. 60. 98. 26
295. 314. 360. 366.
Hurd 176.
Holland 196.
Henry 107. 115. 125. 14
146. 153. 160. 166. 18
231. 235. 282. 288. 29
293. 329. 334. 337. 34
366. 374. 390. 409. 45
453.
Hoadley 9. 64.
Hervey 32.

Huetius 212.
Hughes 216. 388.
Harris 215.
Hulsius 99.
Hedericus 27.
Ikenius 23.
Jennings 251.
Jurieu 95.
King, Sir Peter, 89.
—— John Glen, 3. 114. 122, 123.
Knatchbull 63. 247.
Keckermanus 21. 136.
Leighton 56. 342. 453.
Lampe 56. 87. 147. 245.
Leydeckerus 81.
Limborch 19. 53. 87. 170. 183. 297. 360. 367.
Lewis 36.
Luther 20. 58. 169.
Leigh 26. 99.
Locke 100.
Lightfoot 256. 262. 312.
Lenfant 78.
Markius 85.
Maſtricht 50. 80. 128. 177. 318.
Moſheim 85. 209. 423.
Menochius 87. 372.
Manton 56. 134.
Momma 60. 90.
Morus 128.
Mede 92.
Magdeburg Centuriators 22. 97. 171. 210.
Muſculus 380.
Marſhall 169. 445.
Mintert 27. 193.
Melancthon 377.
Marſham 256.
Meyerus 256.
Morrice 337. 363.
Marloratus 81.
Mayo 446.
Nicholſon 60.
Neale 42. 215.
Newton 386.
Owen 32. 107. 160. 175. 189. 250. 342. 359. 418.
—— James, 299.
Œderus 326.
Pictetus 50. 79. 128.
Pamelius 134.
Patrick 18. 49. 114.
Palmer 170.
Poole 404. 406. 456.
——'s Continuators, 25. 76. 84. 316. 348. 376.
Piſcator 80. 136.
Prideaux 172. 282.
Peirce 427. 439.
Prieſtly 297. 424. 453.
Paſcal 459.
Perkins 128. 134. 453.
Paræus 334.
Paſor 27.
Parkhurſt 27. 193.
Pfeifferus 254.
Reynolds 17.
Roell 19. 55. 100.
Robinſon 406.
Ricaut 122.
Robertſon 114.
Rigaltius 60. 196.
Roque, de la, 167. 171. 195.
Rogers 23. 413.
——— John, 127.
Ridgley 315.
Ravanellus 84.
Rivetus 212. 338.
Rhenferdus 256.
Rutherford 184. 338.
Rathband 338.
Stapferus 4. 19. 55. 71. 125. 170. 418.

Spanhemius 18. 81.
——————— F. 90.
Saxony, Confeſſion of, 124.
Sueveland ——— 52.
Schoettgenius 53. 402.
Salmaſius 16. 83. 133. 194. 224. 421.
Selden 21. 245.
Saurin 47. 160.
Schelhornius 20.
Sanderſon 172. 237.
Suicerus 22. 194. 224. 421.
Steele 3. 148. 150. 176.
Stackhouſe 81.
Scapula 27.
Schrevelius 27.
Schwarzius 28. 35. 193. 402.
Scott 65. 230.
Salmero 115. 412.
Sculteſus 211.
Stillingfleet 98. 172.
Spencer 256.
Sperlingius 256.
Secker 80. 159.
Smyth 163.
Stoddard 238.
Schickardus 256.
Taylor 69. 85. 113. 143. 150. 176. 217. 407. 412. 425. 482.
Turrettinus 48. 134. 149. 183. 215. 295. 409.
——————— J. A. 406.
Trapp 19. 86.
Tillotſon 89. 107.
Towerſon 21. 65. 93. 136. 172.
Tilenus 54.
Twiſſe 333.
Trommius 27.
Towgood 160. 209. 415, 416. 451.
Toletus 372.
Urſinus 184.
Uſher 90.
Vitringa 18. 52. 81. 170. 182. 211. 221. 267. 377. 459.
Vives 194.
Voſſius 57. 89. 211.
Venema 22. 67. 95. 122. 136. 184. 197. 222. 245. 272. 299. 318. 342. 346. 361. 372. 392. 423. 445.
Valeſius 143.
Vatablus 376.
Witſius 16. 45. 75. 78. 122. 126. 162. 355. 359. 377. 454.
Wall 101. 122, 123. 129. 137. 168. 182. 200. 209. 213. 225. 326. 422. 445.
Wolfius 57. 89. 335.
Willet 295.
Waterland 185.
Whitby 101. 156. 183. 318. 348. 360. 366.
Whitefield 94. 230.
Walker 100. 173.
Wetſtenius 25. 100.
Wilſon 26.
Wills 169. 229.
Weſton 212.
Watts 182. 185. 336.
Wats 218.
Walæus 26. 134.
Weſley 14. 82. 115. 230.
Wiſhart 358.
Witherſpoon 166. 466.
Whiſton 278.
Zanchius 18. 52. 83.
Zepperus 25.
Zeltnerus 254.

BRITISH MUSEUM 20 AP 35

THE END.